FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 198 14 October 1986

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Setting-up at Kazakh Monitoring Stations Complete AA 1
Joint INF Session With U.S. Held in Geneva 9 Oct AA 1
'Technical Problems' Delay Talks [AFP] AA 1

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

CEMA Executive Council Meets 8-9 Oct in Moscow BB 1
CEMA Agreement Signed With Ethiopia in Moscow BB 1
Culture Ministers End Conference in Warsaw BB 1

REAGAN-GORBACHEV MEETING

Gorbachev Arrival Speech, Meeting With Icelanders DD 1
Statement on Arrival DD 1
'TASS Comparison' of Statement DD 1
Meeting With Iceland's Leaders DD 2
Reportage on Reagan-Gorbachev Working Meetings DD 3
Meeting Begins 11 Oct DD 3
[VUKOLOV, TURKATENKO, CHUKSEYEV, SHISHKIN]
First Meeting Held, Second Set DD 3
Second Meeting 11 Oct DD 3
First Day's Talks End DD 4
Substance of First Talks DD 4
12 Oct Talks, Working Groups DD 4
Third Meeting Reportedly Ends DD 4
Reagan Says Meeting To Go On DD 5
Meeting Continuation, Peace Groups DD 5
TV Report on Continued Talks [Zorin] DD 5
Disarmament, Security Discussed DD 6
Raisa Gorbacheva Visits Parlimament, Museums DD 6
Visit to School DD 6
Iceland's Prime Minister Interviewed on Meeting DD 7
[Zorin, Alekseyev]
Hermannsson Press Conference DD 8
[Vukolov, Turkatenko, Chukseyev, Shishkin]
Protests, Appeals Linked to Reykjavik Talks DD 9
Anti-U.S. Protests in Reykjavik Talks DD 9
[Vukolov, Turkatenko, Chukseyev, Shishkin]
Peace Run, Finnbogadottir Address DD 10
[Ptashnikov]
Physicians' Peace Appeal DD 11
Refuseniks' Delegation, Appeal [AFP] DD 12
TASS Rejoinder on Flerova DD 12
[Biryukov]
Human Rights Protests [AFP] DD 13

Americans' Reactions to Talks Surveyed DD 14
Weinberger Stance Condemned [Yakubov] DD 14
Senators, Officials Cited DD 15
[Gan, Ignatyev in PRAVDA 11 Oct; IZVESTIYA 11 Oct]
Media, Congress Figures [IZVESTIYA 12 Oct] DD 16
Spokesmen Address Press on Meeting's Goals DD 18
Speakes on Reagan Objectives [Turkatenko] DD 18
Velikhov, Arbatov on Test Ban DD 18
Further on Velikhov, Arbatov DD 20
Commentary on Meeting's Prospects, Proceedings DD 21
PRAVDA on Eve of Talks
[Kolesnichenko, Maslennikov, 11 Oct]
PRAVDA Dispatch 13 Oct DD 23
[Kolesnichenko, Maslennikov]
Zorin on 'Sensible Approach' DD 25
Vorontsev on U.S. Summit [TANJUG] DD 25
Gorbachev Addresses News Conference on Outcome DD 26
Television Version DD 26
PRAVDA Version [14 Oct] DD 42
Gorbachev Departure, Arrival in Moscow DD 57
Farewell in Reykjavik DD 57
Moscow Airport Welcome DD 58
Television Shots of Return DD 58
Reykjavik Outcome Lamented, Blamed on SDI DD 59
[Gan in PRAVDA 14 Oct]
Reagan Tries 'To Decline' Responsibility DD 60

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Moscow-San Francisco Telebridge Carried A 1
Velikhov, Malone, Gale, Izrael
U.S. Authorities Order Plutonium Plant Closings A 1

CHINA

Weinberger 'Attack' on Soviet Policy Cited B 1
Troop Remarks Condemned B 1
[Glebov, Peace and Progress]
Holds Talks, Departs B 2
Rogachev, Wu Xueqian Discuss Reykjavik Summit B 2
[PRAVDA 12 Oct]
Moscow Reports Increased Trade With China B 2

NORTHEAST ASIA

DPRK's Kim Il-song's To Visit in October C 1
TASS Reports U.S. Plane Crashes in South Korea C 1
Marchuk Receives Japanese S & T Delegation C 1
PRAVDA Reports MPRP Delegation's Visit C 1
[5 Oct]

SOUTH ASIA

DRA's Najibullah Discusses Partial Withdrawal D 1
Keshtmand Interview [Seyful-Mulyukov] D 1
Auditing Official Receives PDPA Counterpart D 2

CHINA

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Zholkver Discusses U.S. Pressure on Manila E 1
IZVESTIYA Views Malaysian Scene, Bilateral Ties E 1
[Geronin, 8 Oct]

EASTERN EUROPE

Shevardnadze Arrival in Bucharest Announced F 1
Reportage on Ryzhkov Visit to Warsaw
Arrives in Warsaw F 1
Comments on Rekjavik F 2
Holds Talks With Messner F 2
Messner Praises Moscow's Efforts to Ensure Peace F 3
SED's Mittag Delegation Meets Zaykov, Talyzin F 3
Poland's Kiszczak Cited on Combatting Opposition F 4
[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 9 Oct]
Medvedev Receives MSZMP Department Chief Kotai F 4
Officials Discuss Agro-Industrial Cooperation F 4
[IZVESTIYA 10 Oct]

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Argentine President Alfonsin Arrives in Moscow K 1
Gromyko Receives Alfonsin K 1
Gromyko Speaks at Dinner K 1
Alfonsin Replies K 2
Talks Begin K 3
'Antisubmarine Ships' To Visit Havana 20-24 Oct K 3
Aristov, Mexican Commerce Secretary Hold Talks K 3

CEMA EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETS 8-9 OCT IN MOSCOW

LD092224 Moscow TASS in English 2146 GMT 9 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow October 9 TASS -- The 120th sitting of the Executive Committee of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) held here on October 8 through 9 centered its attention on the implementation of resolutions of the economic summit meeting of the CMEA member countries and on the preparation of materials for the next CMEA session.

For the purpose of the realization of the comprehensive program of scientific and technological program in the CMEA member countries for the period ending in 2000 the Executive Committee analyzed a number of directions of the production specialization and cooperation, including in the production of television equipment. Representatives of CMEA member countries in the Executive Committee exchanged information on the work connected with the implementation of decisions of the economic meeting and on concrete measures aimed at the activization of cooperation with Vietnam.

The Executive Committee discussed questions connected with the development of cooperation of CMEA countries with developing countries and international organizations on a contractural basis.

The sitting of the Executive Committee was held in an atmosphere of friendship and comradely cooperation.

CEMA AGREEMENT SIGNED WITH ETHIOPIA IN MOSCOW

LD140408 Moscow TASS in English 1902 GMT 13 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow October 13 TASS -- An agreement has been signed in Moscow today providing for the setting up of a mixed commission for multilateral cooperation between the CMEA member countries and socialist Ethiopia. As a TASS correspondent was told at the CMEA Secretariat, the socialist community gives Ethiopia assistance in planning, development of the power industry and agriculture, creation of the mining industry, geological prospecting, construction of motor-roads and training of national personnel.

CULTURE MINISTERS END CONFERENCE IN WARSAW

LD101728 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 10 Oct 86

[Text] A conference of the socialist countries' culture ministers ended in Warsaw today. Representatives from Afghanistan, Cambodia, and Nicaragua participated in the work of the conference for the first time. The Soviet delegation was led by Comrade Zakharov, USSR culture minister. Approval was given at the conference to specific measures for strengthening and intensifying multilateral and bilateral cooperation between the socialist states in the field of culture. The ministers advocated expanding joint activities on the international scene and it was decided to devote particular attention to training creative young people and to coordinate efforts in developing the material base of culture within the CEMA framework.

SETTING-UP AT KAZAKH MONITORING STATIONS COMPLETE

LD101848 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 10 Oct 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The setting-up of nuclear test monitoring stations in Kazakhstan has been completed. The establishment of the stations was envisaged by an agreement between U.S. and Soviet scientific organizations within the framework of a joint experiment on monitoring nuclear tests. It was planned to set up a network of seismic stations in direct proximity to Soviet and U.S. nuclear test sites. Now three stations are in operation in Central Kazakhstan. For the time being, there is not a single one in Nevada, although the agreement envisaged the arrival of a group of Soviet scientists in the United States as far back as September. But, because of the unacceptable conditions being put forward by the U.S. authorities, the arrival of the Soviet seismologists in Nevada is impossible for the time being. In the meantime, there is already a third group of U.S. scientists working in Kazakhstan. We filmed this report of the base station in Karkaralinsk on the night when another nuclear blast -- already the 21st since the Soviet moratorium has been in effect -- was being prepared in Nevada. The echo reached the instruments at the monitoring station in Kazakhstan 13 minutes after the blast in Nevada.

[Video shows scientist talking to camera, identified by caption as V.G. Martynov, staff member of the USSR Academy of Sciences Earth Physics Institute]

[Martynov] What is the significance of this work? We seismologists are trying to help society and people to make the world secure. The significance is not in obtaining new scientific data, although they will come, of course. The significance lies in convincing the world, with this cooperation and this joint work, of the possibility of registering any test, of the possibility of monitoring the silence of nuclear test sites.

JOINT INF SESSION WITH U.S. HELD IN GENEVA 9 OCT

LD091320 Moscow TASS in English 1233 GMT 9 Oct 86

[Text] Geneva October 9 TASS -- The group on medium-range nuclear arms held a meeting here today within the framework of the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms.

'Technical Problems' Delay Talks

AU140943 Paris AFP in English 0938 GMT 14 Oct 86

[Text] Geneva, Oct 14 (AFP) -- The U.S.-Soviet talks on nuclear and space weapons have been adjourned a day until Wednesday at the Soviet Union's request, the Soviet mission at the United Nations said here on Tuesday. The delay was due to "technical problems" and did not signify in any way that the negotiations had been interrupted, the mission said. A spokesman at the U.S. mission confirmed that the United States had agreed to the Soviet request for the talks to be put back. The sixth round of negotiations opened here on September 18.

"Statement by Mikhail Gorbachev

"Reykjavik, 10 Oct (TASS) -- The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee arrived here today for a meeting with U.S. President Ronald Reagan. At the airport he made the following statement:

"'Arriving on Icelandic soil, I would like above all to express sincere greetings on behalf of the Soviet people to the Icelandic people and to wish them peace and prosperity. I want to thank the Icelandic Government for agreeing to hold the Soviet-American meeting here in the capital of your country. I understand that we have given the Icelanders a lot to do. All the same you have worked hard. We realize that. In that connection I want to express heartfelt gratitude.

"'My meeting with U.S. President Ronald Reagan begins tomorrow. We have arrived for the meeting moved by a sense of responsibility toward our own people and toward the peoples of other countries for the destiny of the world. I hope that an understanding of his responsibility toward peoples for the destiny of the world is what has brought the President of the United States here too. In any event, that is how I understood his statement yesterday. If this is so, you will agree that this is already quite something for the start of the meeting.

"'We consider that the time has come for actions, serious and decisive actions. The time urgently demands such actions on the part of all people and all states. We are ready to seek solutions to the most vital problems which are worrying the peoples -- solutions such as would make it possible to thoroughly and in practical terms tackle issues of disarmament in order to reach the goal which we have set ourselves, to push aside, to remove the threat of nuclear war. We call upon the entire world community to eliminate nuclear weapons by the end of this century.

"'There, perhaps I shall limit myself to this for the time being. I thank you once again for the meeting. I address these words to the representatives of the president and the prime minister, and to all our esteemed hosts. I thank you for your attention.'"

Meeting With Iceland's Leaders

LD101921 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1858 GMT 10 Oct 86

[Text] Reykjavik, 10 Oct (TASS special correspondent) -- Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, paid a visit today to Vigdis Finnbogadottir, president of the Republic of Iceland. In the course of the coversation, which passed in a friendly atmosphere, an exchange of opinions took place on topical international problems connected with the threat of nuclear war. It was noted on both sides that Soviet-Icelandic relations are developing satisfactorily and on a mutually beneficial basis.

Taking part in the conversation were Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs; Anatoliy Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; and Aleksandr Yakovlev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Steingrimur Hermannsson, premier of Iceland; and Matthias Mathiesen, minister of foreign affairs of Iceland.

GORBACHEV-ARRIVAL SPEECH, MEETING WITH ICELANDERS

Statement on Arrival

LD101504 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1425 GMT 10 Oct 86

[Text] Reykjavik, 10 Oct (TASS) -- The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee arrived here today for a meeting with U.S. President Ronald Reagan. At the airport he made the following statement:

"Arriving on Icelandic soil, I would like above all to express sincere greetings on behalf of the Soviet people to the Icelandic people and to wish them peace and prosperity. I want to thank the Icelandic Government for agreeing to hold the Soviet-American meeting here in the capital of your country. I understand that Icelanders have been very busy. I have been receiving reports on this, and we know what great work you have done, and I want to express heartfelt gratitude for this once again.

"The meeting with President Ronald Reagan begins tomorrow. We have arrived for the meeting, taking as our point of departure the responsibility which we feel toward our own people and toward the peoples of other countries for the destiny of the world. I hope that an understanding of his responsibility toward the peoples for the destiny of the world is what has brought the President of the United States of America here too. In any event, that is how I understood his statement yesterday. If this is so, then you will agree that this is already quite something for the start of the meeting.

"We consider that the time has come for actions, serious and decisive actions. The time urgently demands such actions, and first and foremost from the great powers. I have in mind here both the Soviet Union and the United States of America. But the time demands joint actions on the part of all peoples and all states. We are ready to seek solutions to the most vital problems which are worrying the peoples, and above all solutions that would remove the threats, push aside the threat of nuclear terms tackle issues of disarmament in order to reach the goal which we have set ourselves. We also call upon the entire world community to eliminate nuclear weapons by the end of this century.

"There, perhaps I shall limit myself to this for the time being. I thank you once again for the meeting. I address these words to the representatives of the president and the prime minister, to you, Mr Minister of Foreign Affairs, and to all our esteemed hosts. I thank you."

'TASS Comparison' of Statement

LD102041 [Editorial Report] Moscow TASS International Service in Russian at 1740 GMT on 10 October transmits the following service message to its subscribers followed by Mikhail Gorbachev's statement on arrival in Reykjavik 10 October:

"Attention recipients of TASS information: This report on Mikhail Gorbachev's arrival in Reykjavik and his statement is transmitted for comparison.

REPORTAGE ON REAGAN-GORBACHEV WORKING MEETINGS

Meeting Begins 11 Oct

LD111118 Moscow TASS in English 1057 GMT 11 Oct 86

[Text] Reykjavik October 11 TASS -- From TASS special correspondents [see final paragraph]

A meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan began in Reykjavik today. It is held within the framework of preparations for the visit of the Soviet leader to the United States as agreed in Geneva last November.

At 13.30 Moscow time the limousines of the Soviet delegation arrived at the two-storyed Hofdi Villa on the Atlantic coastline. In keeping with the protocol arrangement Ronald Reagan met Mikhail Gorbachev at the entrance to the villa.

After several minutes before press photographers and TV crews the leaders of the two countries went into the rooms specially ailoted for the talks.

One more summit-level working meeting will be held in the second half of the day today.

The whole world is waiting with great interest for the beginning of the talks between the leaders of the two countries in Hofdi villa.

A TASS correspondent was told that over 2,500 journalists from different countries had been accredited at the international press center to give coverage to the summit meeting.

N. Vukolov, N. Turkatenko V. Chukseyev G Shishkin

First Meeting Held, Second Set

LD111307 Moscow TASS in English 1253 GMT 11 Oct 86

[Text] Reykjavik October 11 TASS -- The first working meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Ronald Reagan, President of the United States of America, was held here today. The second top-level meeting will be held, as agreed, in the afternoon.

Second Meeting 11 Oct

LD111555 Moscow TASS in English 1552 GMT 11 Oct 86

[Text] Reyjkavik October 11 TASS -- by TASS Special correspondents

Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan opened their second working meeting in the Icelandic capital today.

These talks at summit level are part of preparations for the Soviet leader's visit to the United States under an understanding reached in Geneva in November last year.

According to a protocol agreement, Mikhail Gorbachev met Ronald Reagan at the entrance to the Hofdi House, where the summit talks are being held.

First Day's Talks End

LD111804 Moscow TASS in English 1802 GMT 11 Oct 86

[Text] Reykjavik October 11 TASS -- (Special TASS correspondent) -- Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan ended their talks in the capital of Iceland for today. The two leaders today had two working meetings which lasted a total of about 4 hours. By agreement, the meetings were confidential.

Substance of First Talks

LD111838 Moscow TASS in English 1835 GMT 11 Oct 86

[Text] Reykjavik October 11 TASS -- (TASS special correspondents) -- Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan discussed in the first two rounds of their talks the overall condition of the current international situation and Soviet-American relations and problems of ending the nuclear arms race.

12 Oct Talks, Working Groups

LD121021 Moscow TASS in English 1015 GMT 12 Oct 86

[Text] Reykjavik October 12 TASS -- Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan began their third working meeting in the Icelandic capital today. These summit talks are part of preparations for the Soviet leader's visit to the United Stater under an understanding reached in Geneva in November last year. The leaders of the two countries held two working meetings yesterday, which lasted for a total of about four hours. It was decided during the second meeting to set up two work groups of experts to discuss the key issues on the agenda of the meeting between the two leaders. One group discussed arms control, while the other humanitarian issues, regional issues and bilateral relations.

Third Meeting Reportedly Ends

LD121358 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1342 GMT 12 Oct 86

[Moscow TASS International Service in Russian at 1348 GMT on 11 October transmits a service message killing the following item]

[Text] Reykjavik, 12 Oct (TASS special correspondent) -- The talks between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU CLentral Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan have ended here.

Today the leaders of the two countries held their third and final conversation in the framework of the 2-day working meeting in the Icelandic capital.

Reagan Says Meeting To Go On

LD121408 Moscow TASS in English 1406 GMT 12 Oct 86

[Text] Reykjavik October 12 TASS -- After the third conversation between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan the U.S. President, who saw the Soviet leader off, told newsmen that they were not yet through with their meeting and would continue it, after a break, at 1500 GMT.

Meeting Continuation, Peace Groups

LD121422 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1408 GMT 12 Oct 86

[Text] Reykjavik, 12 Oct (TASS special correspondents) -- Today M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan held their third conversation within the framework of the working meeting which is taking place in Iceland's capital. The sides have agreed to meet again at 1500 GMT.

Not far from Hofdi House representatives of the peace movement and of the Icelandic and international public gathered by the ocean's shore. "Peace with weapons is no peace at all!", "There's no future with nuclear weapons!", "Give the planet a chance. Children need peace!" -- These slogans, which stood out particularly clearly under the rays of sun that peeped through the stormclouds, reflected those hopes and aspirations that the peoples of the world attach to the summit meeting in the Icelandic capital.

TV Report on Continued Talks

LD121834 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 12 Oct 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast, special correspondent V. Zorin report from Reykjavik]

[Text] Intensive work continued through today at the Soviet-U.S. meeting in the Icelandic capital. It was originally planned that the talks between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and President Reagan would end in the first half of the day. However, after the end of the first meeting, which incidentally lasted 1 and 1/2 hours longer than planned, it was announced that the talks would be continued.

With the so-called blackout declared by mutual agreement of the sides -- keeping the talks confidential and an absence of information for the press -- the journalists here can only guess at what is going on behind the tightly shut doors at the Hofdi villa. However, the very fact that active talks are still going on is viewed by many observers as a significant and possibly encouraging sign. It has been announced that immediately after the end of the meeting, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev will give a press conference in one of the city halls.

Disarmament, Security Discussed

LD121844 Moscow TASS in English 1841 GMT 12 Oct 86

["Reykjavik Meeting End" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Reykjavik October 12 TASS -- By TASS special correspondents -- Two meetings were held today between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Ronald Reagan, President of the United States.

The two sides discussed key issues of nuclear disarmament and ways of ensuring international security.

RAISA GORBACHEVA VISITS PARLIAMENT, MUSEUMS

LD121244 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1208 GMT 12 Oct 86

[Text] Reykjavik, 12 oct (TASS special correspondent) -- During her stay in Iceland Raisa Gorbacheva visited the Althing, the country's parliament, where leaders of the supreme legislative organ described its activity.

In the Mueseum of Ancient Manuscripts she was shown originals of the Icelandic sagas containing information on links between Russia and Iceland which go back deep into the centuries. A jubilee edition of the "Lay of Igor's Host" was presented to the museum to commemorate the visit. Staff at the National Museum showed the visitor documents of the country's history and objects of daily life and culture of the Icelandic people.

During the conversation that took place those present were told about the development of the folk industries and cultural traditions of the republics of the Soviet Union. They were told how the Soviet state shows concern for the preservation of cultural monuments.

Raisa Gorbacheva was shown a unique collection of works by the outstanding Icelandic Sulptor E. Jonsson.

She also visited B. Paulsson, an Icelandic farmer. He thanked her for the interest she had shown, told her about his family, and extended traditional Icelandic hospitality.

During the meetings and conversations, which passed in a warm and cordial atmospohere, the Icelanders paid great attention to the life of the Soviet people.

Visit to School

LD112356 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2205 GMT 11 Oct 86

[From the "Novosti" newscast; B. Kalyagin video report on Raisa Maksimovna Gorbacheva visit to an elementary school in Reykjavik on 11 October -- recorded]

[Text] Raisa Maksimovna Gorbacheva visited one of Reykjavik's elementary schools where she met with representatives of Icelandic youth.

Last summer a large group of Icelandic students sent messages to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Reagan calling for a halt to the arms race. Today, when the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting opened in Reykjavik, the reply of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, which stressed the determination of the USSR to do everything to avert a nuclear catastrophe, was handed over to the Icelandic youth. In addition, Raisa Maksimovna Gorbacheva, at the request of Mikhail Sergeyevich, handed a memorable present to the students -- a work by Estonian sculptor Valk, Joyful Spring, which symbolizes the youths' belief in a happy future.

The Icelandic boys and girls thanked Raisa for the attention given to their appeal and for the present and said that the young generation of Iceland seeks peace.

Raisa Maksimovna Gorbacheva then addressed the teachers and students. She stressed that millions of inhabitants of our planet are against the nuclear threat. I do not doubt, she said, that through a joint efforts people shall avert a nuclear holocaust.

ICELAND'S PRIME MINISTER INTERVIEWED ON MEETING

LD100208 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 9 Oct 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast; "special correspondent" Valentin Zorin report from Reykjavik including interview with Steingrimur Hermannsson, prime minister of Iceland, conducted by Spartak Alekseyev; Hermannsson speaks in English with superimposed Russian translation, date not given -- live or recorded]

[Excerpts] [Zorin] Final preparations are being completed in Reykjavik for the event that today captivates the attention of people throughout the world: the meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Ronald Reagan, President of the United States of America. [passage omitted]

[Alekseyev] The Government of Iceland is striving to create the most favorable conditions so that the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Reykjavik will proceed successfully and fruitfully. We are in the residence of Mr Steingrimur Hermannsson, prime minister of Iceland, who has kindly agreed to be interviewed on Soviet television at the threshold of the meeting.

Answering a question on how he evaluates the significance of the summit meeting in Reykjavik, which for the first time in its history has become the location for an event of such scale, Steingrimur Hermannsson said: Our country, of course, is a representative of the West but we, over the course of many years, have had very good relations with both the Soviet Union and the United States. Superb trade and diplomatic relations with the USSR and tourist ties, and so on, have developed in our country. We are very proud of the fact that Iceland was chosen for the meeting of the leaders of the USSR and the United States. As far as we know the proposal for the meeting in Reykjavik was made by General Secretary Gorbachev and we are extremely grateful to him for that choice. We, like all the peoples of the world, hope that a real step forward will be made in Reykjavik and, on our part, we will apply all efforts to make the meeting successful.

Further, on the subject of the latest Soviet initiatives, the prime minister of Iceland stressed that his country advocates the most speedy banning and destruction of all nuclear weapons.

Iceland believes that the banning of nuclear tests would be a positive step in that direction. The reduction of medium-range missiles could become another such step. It is very important that every country, even a small one, should use its influence for averting a nuclear catastrophe. The Icelandic parliament has unanimously adopted a resolution calling for the creation of a nuclear free zone in northern Europe. We are not permitting the deployment in Iceland of nuclear weapons or missiles capable of carrying such weapons, but we would like such a zone to be far more extensive.

[Zorin] The climate of the Icelandic capital is determined by the influence of the warm waters of the Gulf stream and hot geysers which countervail the cold winds of the nearby Arctic. Today this circumstance is acquiring the nature of political symbolism, but the matter lies not simply in symbolism. The Soviet initiative opens up the way to a real improvement in the world political climate.

Hermannsson Press Conference

LD101319 Moscow TASS in English 1302 GMT 10 Oct 86

[Text] Reykjavik October 10 TASS -- By TASS special correspondents Nikolay Vukolov, Nikolay Turkatenko, Vitaliy Chukseyev and Gennadiy Shishkin.

The last preparations for a working meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan, which opens in the Icelandic capital Saturday, have been practically completed.

Responding to journalists' congratulations on the Icelandic Government having done, in a very short time, everthing in its power to provide the best possible conditions for work by the leaders of the two powers, the members of their delegations, experts and reporters, Prime Minister Steingrimur Hermannsson of Iceland told a news conference here today that by giving its consent to such an important meeting to be held in Reykjavik, his government had assumed appropriate obligations which it had done its utmost to fulfil.

The attending newsmen showered him with questions about the results he expected from the meeting between the leaders of the USSR and the United States.

Steingrimur Hermannsson replied that he was not going to make any predictions and would only say that if the working meeting in Reykjavik led to another, this time formal, meeting between the two leaders planned in Washington, that in itself would be very important because it would be clear that they not only had subjects to continue talking about but also that some practical steps had been outlined.

The Icelandic prime minister recalled that Mikhail Gorbachev had expressed readiness to visit the United States only if conditions were prepared for achieving concrete accords to curtail the arms race.

The exceptional importance of such accords not only to the Soviet Union and the United States but also to all other countries, big and small, could be illustrated on the example of Iceland, Steingrimur Hermannsson said.

This country, he said, was geographically located so that it had practically not been grazed by the past two world wars, but today no country, the more so Iceland which was situated in what was a strategic region from the military point of view, would be able to escape the flames of a nuclear conflagration.

The Icelandic prime minister also stressed the importance of such a step on the road to solving the problems of halting and reversing the arms race as a moratorium on all nuclear testing, which, as is known, has already been unilaterally declared by the Soviet Union.

One's readiness to declare the moratorium, he explained, indicated one's resolve to take also other steps towards disarmament.

PROTESTS, APPEALS LINKED TO REYKJAVIK TALKS

Anti-U.S. Protests in Reykjavik

LD111506 Moscow TASS in English 1423 GMT 11 Oct 86

[Excerpts] Rejkjavik October 11 TASS -- By TASS special correspondents [see last paragraph]

Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan began a meeting in Reykjavik today, which is being held as part of preparations for the Soviet leader's visit to the United States under an understanding reached in Geneva in November last year. [passage omitted]

But the issues now being discussed in the Hofdi House are a matter of profound concern not only for the more than 2,500 newsmen covering the event but also for the people of all countries. This is why delegations from different peace organizations in the United States and a number of West European countries have also come here in time for the start of the meeting.

Despite the differences in their political convictions and views, the representatives of these organizations are united by common concern over the fate of the world and by a shared desire to prevent mankind from sliding into the nuclear abyss. They urge the leaders of the two great powers to take steps to ward off and remove the threat of a nuclear war.

In this connection, the world public welcomed the Soviet Union's concrete contribution to that process, primarily the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions introduced by our country.

A delegation of American public groups, nuclear weapons freeze campaign and Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, arrived here and brought a message to the U.S. President.

The message urges the administration to stop nuclear testing at long last and join in the soviet moratorium.

The nuclear test ranges should remain silent till the next summit meeting, stressed the message signed, among others, by 60 members of the U.S. Congress. And in the future a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty should be concluded.

The Sirius, a ship of the international organization of environmentalists "Greenpeace", dropped anchor in Reykjavik harbor today. A statement for the press circulated by "Greenpeace" here urged the leaders of the two countries to discuss vital problems in earnest, and first of all, to reach agreement on the prohibition of nuclear tests. If nuclear tests are terminated, the statement said, this will assist in stopping the "star wars" program the implementation of which would lead to a large-scale escalation of offensive and defensive weapon systems in space and on earth. Greenpeace recalled that the Soviet Union had not conducted nuclear explosions unilaterally since August 1985. There is a historic chance now for making U.S. test ranges silent, too. The meeting in Reykjavik, the statement emphasized, should non become a meeting for the meeting's sake.

Yesterday night, torches illuminated the small street in Reykjavik, the site of the American Embassy, as Icelandic peace groups staged a demonstration in protest at the U.S. policy of confrontation, military threats and adventurism in respect to Nicaragua and other independent countries.

The demonstrators handed over a petition to the embassy, conveying their strong condemnation of the aggression against the Nicaraguan people.

The protesters also urged the U.S. Administration to demonstrate its sincere striving peace at the summit meeting in the Icelandic capital.

Ragnar Stefensson, one of the leaders of the Icelandic Committee of Solidarity With El Salvador, told TASS, "we welcome all proposals and measures directed at curbing the arms race, above all the nuclear arms race. The Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions is, in our view, precisely such an important step."

The Icelandic movement for peace "Campaign Against Military Bases" issued a statement calling for efforts to stop the arms race and rid the world of the Nuclear threat. The peace campaigners came out in favour of dismantling NATO's major military base in Iceland and establishing a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe.

Participants in the first earth [Moscow TASS International Service in Russian at 1326 GMT on 11 October in an identical report renders this as "peace flame [plamya mira]] run, sponsored by the United Nations, arrived to the park on the shores of Lake Tjornin at mid-day today. The torch relay is being conducted under the Motto "Give the World Chance -- Children Need Peace."

Nikolay Vukolov, Nikolay Turkatenko, Vitaliy Chukseyev, Gennadiy Shishkin

Peace Run, Finbogadottir Address

LD112210 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 11 Oct 86

[Andrey Ptashnikov report from Reykjavik]

[Text] The conversations between Comrade Gorbachev and President Reagan began this morning at Hofdi, the house belonging to the Icelandic Government, which is a traditional place for receiving high-level foreign visitors.

Journalists are not being admitted to the talks, since these are strictly confidential in character, in accordance with the understanding between the two sides. It is only at the end of each day that official representatives of the delegations are due to give correspondents information of the most general nature about the progress-of-the talks.

A whole range of major public antiwar events have been timed to coincide with the Soviet-American working meeting at the summit level in Reykjavik. One of these took place today right in the center of the city. This is a peace relay, or round-the-world run, as it is also being called. It is dedicated to the current international year of peace, which is being held at the decision of the United Nations. The run, in which famous sportsmen from the USSR, the United States and other countries are taking part, began in New York on 16 September and is due to end in the same place -- near the UN headquarters building -- on 11 December. The route being followed crosses the territory of nearly 50 states. A solemn ceremony for lighting a symbolic peace flame took place in Central Park in the city. Taking part in it were the president and prime minister of Iceland. This flame will burn for the duration of the Soviet-American summit meeting, expressing, as it were, the hope of mankind that it will to a considerable extent promote the end of the arms race and the removal of the threat of nuclear war.

This is what Vigdis Finnbogadottir, president of Iceland, had to say in her address at the ceremony:

[Begin Finnbogadottir recording in Icelandic with superimposed Russian translation] Icelanders, says Vigdis Finnbogadottir, the Icelandic president, and the peoples of all countries of the world desire peace. They very much want to live without any fear that the civilization of mankind might perish as a result of nuclear explosions. So by our joint efforts let us do everything possible to ensure that this does not happen. The meeting between the leaders of the USSR and the United States which is currently taking place in Reykjavik can do a lot in this direction. May our planet always be a peaceful one, and may neither the present nor the next generation ever know what war is, the president of Iceland stressed. [end recording]

Physicians' Peace Appeal

LD111025 Moscow TASS in English 0912 GMT 11 Oct 86

[Text] New York October 11 TASS -- International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW) has called for an end to the nuclear arms race. The statement by the organization, which groups more than 150,000 people in fifty countries, released in Boston, said that peace could be preserved not by constantly developing new types of weapons and devising a new technology for their manufacture, not by the mere proclamation of the ideals of peace.

The peace called for firm and concrete commitments based on the reality, it said. The appeal also called for the abolition of all nuclear arsenals.

The international movement's leaders intend to convey the text of their appeal to Reykjavik where the Soviet-American summit meeting is in progress.

'Refuseniks' Delegation, Appeal

AU101906 Paris AFP in English 1840 GMT 10 Oct 86

[By Anne Penketh]

[Excerpts] Reykjavik, Oct 10 (AFP) -- Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev arrived here Friday for his weekend meeting with U.S. President Ronald Reagan, saying the time had come for "action and serious decisions" by the United States and Soviet Union on disarmament. [passage omitted]

While the Soviet side was pressing for arms control to be the main summit issue, U.S. officials stressed Friday that human rights would be at least as important, and representatives of Soviet Jewry here spoke out against the Soviet Union's treatment of its Jewish community, charging human rights violations. [passage omitted]

At a press conference Friday, the National Conference on Soviet Jewry, represented by a delegation of eight U.S. Jewish leaders, introduced relatives of Soviet "refuseniks" still waiting to be reunited.

And Soviet emigre Mikhail Sherman, a leukemia victim who flew in here from Israel yesterday, appealed during Mrs. Ridgway's briefing for his sister Ina Flerova to be allowed to leave the Soviet Union with her husband in order to "save his life" with a bone-marrow graft.

(In Moscow Friday, after being summoned to the OVIR, the Soviet body which issues visas, Mrs. Flerova said that officials had told her there was still no decision on her case.)

Soviet officials here rejected accusations that Moscow was "flagrantly" violating human rights by preventing the reunification of families, and a Foreign Ministry spokesman, Andrey Grachov, said that if the Jewish emigres wanted to be reunited with their families all they had to do was to return home. [passage omitted]

TASS Rejoinder on Flerova

LD121535 Moscow TASS in English 1502 GMT 12 Oct 86

["Flerova in No Hurry To Aid Brother -- TASS Rejoinder" -- TASS take identifier]

[Text] Moscow October 12 TASS -- By Tass commentator Vadim Biryukov

It is the fate of mankind that is at stake in Reykjavik on these days: People are looking forward to solutions that will help diminish the threat of nuclear war.

The historic significance of the meeting seems to be of little concern to the Zionists, however. Their provocative intrigues are directed at spoiling the atmosphere around the Reykjavik meeting through the use of base ways and means.

Way back on August 20, Soviet competent bodies issued a permission for Soviet citizen Inessa Flerova to leave the USSR for Israel.

Flerova motivated her request by the need to hurry to Israel to donate bone marrow to her brother Mikhail Shirman suffering from a lethal disease.

The Soviet competent bodies suspected at that time already that Flerova was speculating on the dramatic situation. But since disease was a serious matter, Flerova was given proper documents to go to "save her brother."

Regrettably, the suspicion has turned into confidence. Mikhail Shirman in person appeared in Reykjavik on Friday -- direct from Tel Aviv. On every possible occasion he has been accusing Soviet authorities of "inhuman attitudes" and even the violation of human rights.

Well, but what about Inessa Flerova? Six weeks have already passed since she obtained the permission to leave. Now, she says, she can go to help her brother only together with her husband. But her husband is unable to settle the emigration issue with his parents.

Shirman, rather than taking a careful look at this purely family matter, has joined anti-Soviet demonstrations with the energy unusual for a "terminal patient."

Representatives of the Zionist circles openly use him as a martyr, as a victim of Moscow's policies.

One can assume, however, that it would be better for Shirman's health if the Zionists and their patrons, including Robers Torricelli, a member of the House of Representatives of U.S. Congress, who was especially dismayed at the Soviets' lack of sympathy, direct their noble indignation at Inessa Flerova.

For some reason, she is in no hurry to aid her brother.

Human Rights Protests

AU111747 Paris AFP in English 1726 GMT 11 Oct 86

[Excerpts] Reykjavik, Oct 11 (AFP) -- Relatives and friends of Soviet Jews Saturday painted a dark picture of human rights abuses in the Soviet Union, representing testimony to show that the treatment of political prisoners and dissidents under Mikhail Gorbachev was harsher than in previous regimes. At a press conference held on the sidelines of Mr. Gorbachev's meeting here with the U.S. President which opened Saturday, spokesmen of various, U.S.-based lobby groups noted with irony that the crackdown against dissidents came at a time that the Kremlin was priding itself on its reforms and a new image.

The groups were represented by former dissidents Ludmilla Alekseva and Aleksander Slepak, and by Aleks Goldfarb who said his father David Goldfarb refused to cooperate with the KGB in 1984 by setting up journalist Nicholas Daniloff. [passage omitted]

Mrs. Alekseva, a former member of the Helsinki human rights monitoring groups, quoted Anatoliy Shcharanskiy who was freed from labour camp last February as saying political prisoners were deprived of visits from relatives, placed in punishment cells and had their food rationed.

She also quoted a recent letter from worker-writer Anatoliy Marhenko, who has seen labour camps and prison under three different Soviet regimes, and who said that the current situation was by far the worst he had endured. In the letter, addressed to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe which opens its latest session in Vienna on November 4, he said:

"During my five years of imprisonment, I have been abused and tormented. Many times I have been subjected to 15-day confinement in the prison's punishment cell, where the inmates are stripped of warm clothes and fed every other day" in freezing temperatures. He is currently on a hunger strike, Mrs. Alekseva said to protest conditions.

Soviet Jewish groups have been active before the summit here, frequently appearing at Soviet briefing and challenging officials to discuss the cases of their relatives refused permission to emigrate.

On Thursday and Friday they received a sympathetic hearing, and Aleksander Slepak, the son of veteran refusenik Vladimir Slepak who has been waiting 17 years for an exit visa, was granted a hearing by Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov.

But on Saturday, when they tried to intervene at a Soviet briefing, holding up photographs of their relatives in the Soviet Union, Soviet officials refused to listen, and they were expelled from the meeting in a Reykjavik hotel.

When one Jewish representative mentioned the Soviet Jewry committee in Stockholm, he was brushed off with a curt "you mean the anti-Soviet Jewry committee." [passage omitted]

AMERICANS' REACTION TO TALKS SURVEYED

Weinberger Stance Condemned

LD111539 Moscow TASS in English 1532 GMT 11 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow October 11 TASS -- By TASS analyst Dmitriy Yakubov

It has become a rule that wherever and whenever Caspar Weinberger speaks, he invariably raises his pet topic -- the myth of the Soviet military threat. The Soviet Union, the Pentagon chief alleges, poses the chief threat to America. Weinberger reiterates this again and again, grossly distorting facts and passing on to the listeners, readers and television viewers the false "militarist arithmetic" designed to intimidate the man in the street and justify the U.S. huge military spending.

Before becoming defense secretary, Weinberger was vice-president of the large California-based Bechtel Corporation. The growth of the corporation's profits is directly proportionate with the value of military orders obtained from the Pentagon.

It is proximity to this leading military-industrial corporation and belonging to the military-industrial complex which determine Weinberger's political views -- those of a zealous advocate of the "position-of-strength" policy and arms race.

It is Weinberger who initiated the publication of the Pentagon's anti-Soviet fabrication "Soviet Military Power", issued in the fifth edition in the U.S. with his foreword.

The authors then turn to the second question they asked of senators: "Since, to judge by opinion poll data, the overwhelming majority of Americans consider that a nuclear test ban is one of the most promising spheres for reaching agreement, we attempted to clarify the attitude of senators toward this problem. The picture here is far from uniform. Opinions in favor of reaching agreement with or without reservations were expressed by 23 Democrats and 8 Republicans from the legislators we polled. Opinions against were given by 21 Republicans and 4 Democrats. Ten Democrats and 14 Republicans refused to give or avoided giving an answer."

Gan and Ignatyev then cite statements by Senators C. Mathias, M. Hatfield, and P. Simon and the official statement made by Senator G. Hart. According to them, "Some senators, while supporting the idea of moratorium or talks on total and universal nuclear test ban, make its implementation conditional on various reservations," and they go on to cite Senators M. Baucus, A. Dixon, and S. Gorton. The authors say that "many senators are in favor of different steps to limit or terminate nuclear tests. Nonetheless, equally firm positions are held by legislators who are altogether opposed to the taking of measures in this direction."

Having cited Senators O. Hatch, J. Heinz, and C. Hecht, Gan and Ignatyev conclude: "In the course of our poll we received answers from 80 out of the 100 senators or their official representatives. For various reasons, we failed to obtain the viewpoint of several legislators. Some of them were altogether unwilling to 'have any contact' with Soviet journalists."

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 October Morning Edition carries on page 1 an unattributed roundup of reaction to the Reykjavik meeting by government and public figures and newspapers around the world. According to the introduction, "There is enormous interest in the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. Mankind also feels enormous anxiety over the problems of today and the main one among them -- the problems of curbing and terminating the arms race. The earth's people also place enormous hopes on the Reykjavik meeting, hopes that a solution to these problems will be found at long last."

The statements cited included the following utterance attributed to a "High-ranking representative of the U.S. Administration": "The meeting will give the two leaders an opportunity to discuss in an informal and private atmosphere the progress achieved in all spheres of our relations and to define wherever possible, in general outline rather than in detail, the spheres where participants in talks that are already being held could concentrate their efforts as we move closer to the Washington visit by General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev. We do not expect any agreements [my ne ozhidayem soglasheniy]. We expect a calm [spokoynyy] examination of the entire agenda."

Media, Congress Figures Cited

PM121909 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Oct 86 Morning Edition p 4

["Own Correspondent" dispatch under general heading "Mankind's Eyes and Hopes Focused on Reykjavik": "The Majority's Optimism"]

[Text] Washington -- The leading U.S. television commentators are not in the television studios today: They are broadcasting live from Iceland's capital. Articles by famous observers are datelined "Reykjavik."

It is Weinberger who baselessly accused the Soviet Union of violating the SALT 2 Treaty. It is Weinberger the advocate of U.S. military superiority who proclaimed that the "Strategic Defence Initiative" was the best means to maintain peace. The list of facts and examples is endless.

It is noteworthy that the Pentagon chief's groaning and moaning about the non-existent "Soviet threat" became particularly intensive on the eve of the Soviet-American summit in Reykjavik. In this connection, one should take into account the fact that, prior to the Geneva meeting that started Soviet-American dialogue, Weinberger sent a letter to the President urging him not to confirm at the talks with the Soviet Union the U.S. commitment under the ABM and SALT 2 treaties.

The history is repeating itself now. Weinberger is doing his utmost to compromise the Soviet Union and its peaceful policy and vitiate the atmosphere of the Reykjavik meeting.

It goes without saying that defusing tension in the world is no easy task. Its solution demands a painstaking, constructive advancement, creation of an atmosphere of goodwill and trust among the contracting parties. Weinberger's efforts and statements are directed in the opposite direction.

Senators, Officials Cited

PM121431 [Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 October 1986 First Edition carries on page 4 under the headline "Washington, Capitol Hill.... Senators Answer Correspondents' Questions" a 1,500-word dispatch by its own correspondent V. Gan and TASS correspondent I. Ignatyev, datelined Washington, 10 October.

According to the authors, "The task we set ourselves in addressing the legislators and their advisers was to obtain an impression of the mood of members of the upper chamber of Congress and their opinion on the eve of the discussion between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan.

"Our first question concerned senators' reaction to the reaching of agreement to hold the Iceland meeting. Here are their replies."

They go on to quote sentences or brief passages from positive replies given by Senators S. Thurmond, R. Dole, R. Byrd, R. Lugar, C. Pell, and S. Nunn, and say that "We were unsuccessful in obtaining an answer from B. Goldwater, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, who consistently upholds the administration's interests."

Gan and Ignatyev continue. "The above statements in no way indicate an identical attitude by senators toward the Soviet-U.S. exchange of opinions on Icelandic soil. A fairly considerable proportion of the legislators refused altogether to comment on the meeting, others spoke in support of it but with certain reservations, yet others insisted on the need to bring to the foreground at the meeting secondary questions which have nothing to do with the main issue which constitutes the essence of our relations."

They do, however describe as "typical" the opinion of Senators J. Biden, C. Dodd, T. Harkin, E. Kennedy, F. Lautenberg, C. Mathias, P. Laxalt, and A. Simpson, who "expressed hope that the meeting will achieve progress in the sphere of arms control, improvement of relations, and better mutual understanding." "Optimistic" views were apparently also expressed by Senators R. Long and D. Evans.

SPOKESMEN ADDRESS PRESS ON MEETING'S GOALS

Speakes on Reagan Objectives

LD110659 Moscow TASS in English 0657 GMT 11 Oct 86

[Text] Reykjaivk October 11 TASS -- By TASS special correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko:

Larry Speakes, principal deputy press secretary of the White House, at a press conference here on Friday, read out the White House's statement devoted to the forthcoming meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan and the U.S. stand at the meeting.

He said that Reagan had studied Gorbachev's statement made on arrival in Iceland.

The White House spokesman disclosed that Reagan would report to the American people about the meeting on Monday evening.

The President's objective, Speakes observed, was to build relations with the Soviet Union on a more constructive long-term basis. The U.S., he said, saw the differences between the two countries and realized that this process should be carried out gradually, step by step.

According to Speakes, the U.S. President favoured the total elimination of nuclear armaments. The White House spokesman said that they were glad that General Gorbachev shared this objective.

Both leaders, Speakes went on to say, came to the conclusion that deeds, rather than words were needed for a long-term improvement in bilateral relations and that American side was determined to go its path of the road.

He expressed the hope that the Soviet Union shared this determination to undertake constructive actions and that the Iceland talks would result in progress in this area.

Velikhov, Arbatov on Test Ban

LD111559 Moscow TASS in English 1551 GMT 11 Oct 86

[Text] Reykjavik Octber 11 TASS -- (From TASS special correspondent):

A regular meeting of correspondents with Soviet experts took place at the Soviet press centre today. The journalists were addressed by Yevgeniy Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and Academician Georgiy Arbatov, director of the Institute of U.S. and Canadian Studies.

The main subject which journalists took interest in was the problem of a total ban on nuclear tests and the removal of nuclear threat.

Why does the Soviet Union attach such great importance to the termination of nuclear explosions?

There is enormous interest. The Reykjavik meeting is the main theme of U.S. mass news media. It is the only subject for all regular television programs on international affairs. Programs are often interrupted to flash the latest news reports from the capital of Iceland.

All television channels broadcast reports on the arrival of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in Reykjavik.

The topic of disarmament occupies a leading position in commentaries and articles on the meeting. There are preceptible shades of difference in the materials, but nevertheless optimistic views predominate. Moreover, these moods are also reflected in statements by U.S. officials. White House Deputy Press Secretary L. Speakes said in an interview with CBS-TV: "We are in an optimistic mood because we believe that opportunities exist to achieve certain progress."

Many commentaries point out that the meeting "could give an impetus to the disarmament talks in Geneva." Observers emphasize that "personal contacts are always positive. They offer opportunities for better understanding of the sides' positions, quest for points of contact, and elaboration of practical agreements on this basis." The word "hope" is frequently encountered next to the word "Reykjavik" on the pages of U.S. newspapers.

Hope that the process of disarmament will spread to important spheres is also expressed by many people in the United States, including those in Congress. "The main point," Senator William Proxmire emphasized, "is to liquidate nuclear weapons and prevent the militarization of space. Our country," the senator said, "needs not an intensificaton of an arms race in which there can be no victors, but a series of arms control agreements which would block the path to nuclear catastrophe."

But not everyone voices such sensible ideas. The House of Representatives, which upheld its bill to limit U.S. military programs, ultimately capitulated in the face of the administration's demands and moved to positions of "strongarm diplomacy." People here say that the House gave the President a free hand in the mistaken belief that the "strong America" factor could help international agreements.

While different points of view regarding the ways to achieve arms control agreements are put forward in Congress, the ultraright wing invariably upholds the stance of stubborn opposition to international accord and the holding of the Reykjavik meeting itself. THE WASHINGTON POST observer Stephen Rosenfeld writes that "the conservatives have lost their nerve" -- this is how he understates the surge of fury which has gripped the rightwingers who are trying to obstruct the achievement of practical agreements in this sphere.

But the majority of Americans, as shown, incidentally, by the latest opinion polls, are in favor of international dialogue, the Reykajvik meeting, and its fruitful outcome. The USSR Embassy in Washington continues to receive letters from U.S. citizens acclaiming the Soviet Union's peace-loving policy. The first reactions to the Reykjavik meeting have already been received. Here is one of them from Brian Kelly from San Antonio: "I acclaim the initiative of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, about the leaders' meeting in Reykjavik. So far only the USSR has taken any practical steps as regards curbing the arms race. An example of this is the Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests. I hope that the United States will follow this example."

In answer to this question, Yevgeniy Velikhov said such a measure would become an effective step on the way to implementing the accords which had been reached at the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva. A nuclear war cannotd be won and, therefore, it should not be fought. There should be no striving of one side for military superiority over the other side.

Talks on all aspects of nuclear disarmament should be expedited.

It was emphasised at the press conference that the attainment of all these goals was incompatible with the continuation of nuclear tests.

The Soviet Union observes its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions. Upon return from Geneva President Reagan had stated that it was essential to reduce, first of all, destabilising types of weapons. But the continuation of nuclear tests is precisely such a destabilising factor in the arms race. The tests are conducted with one purpose: to develop new, still more dangerous types of weapons of mass destruction.

Academician Arbatov recalled that the opponents of an end to nuclear tests motivate their refusal to join the Soviet moratorium by arguing that tests are ostensibly necessary to check the reliability of nuclear arsenals and that as long as such arsenals exist, nuclear tests are necessary as well.

Such an argument is neither more nor less than an unscrupulous, ill-intentioned stratagem. Those who keep telling about the need to go ahead with nuclear tests to "check the reliability" of nuclear arsenal are preoccupied with something quite different: the development of new destabilising types of weapons, such as for example, nuclear-pumped laser weapons.

This is precisely what the United States does, and this is why Washington has cardinally changed its attitude with regard to the talks aimed at elaborating a treaty on a total ban on nuclear tests, a treaty the main features of which were coordinated between the USSR and the United States under previous U.S. Administrations.

The present U.S. Government, in order to bolster up its stand, alluded to the Soviet Union's "unwillingness to go to the establishment of an effective verification system".

Meanwhile, the Soviet Union not only expressed readiness to participate in establishing such a system but has also agreed to the presence of American scientists and American nuclear equipment near the nuclear test range in the area near Semipalatinsk. The United States, however, bring about new problems.

Thus, Academician Yevgeniy Velikhov emphasised, Soviet scientists, who would like to arrive at the U.S. test area for the same purposes, have been unable up to now to get visas for entry into the United States.

A spokesman of the White House stated yesterday that the United States was prepared under certain conditions to ratify the 1975 threshold treaty and the treaty on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes.

In so doing the spokesman presented this decision of the United States as a manifestation of readiness to solve the problems of the nuclear arms race.

Such a stand, Georgiy Arbatov said, boils down simply to a regulation of nuclear tests and does not solve in any way the problem of their termination. Nuclear explosions have been for long regulated, ever since the beginning of the sixties. But the arms race has been intensifying. So, such a stand of the United States constitutes an attempt to divert attention from the real problem to a far-fetched one, and thereby to hinder a solution to the most real problem.

Further on Velikhov, Arbatov

LD112133 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 11 Oct 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast; special correspondent Zorin video report on 11 October press conference given by Yevgeniy Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and Academician Georgiy Arbatov, director of the United States of America and Canada Institute, and the Soviet press center in Reykjavik -- recorded]

[Excerpts] [Zorin] A blackout -- that is how, in journalistic terms, the accord is termed on the absence of official information about the progress of conversations between the two leaders, and this has put several thousand journalists who have specially come to the capital of Iceland on what is known as hungry rations. This is why even more interest has been evoked by the press conference held this morning at the Soviet press center by experts from the Soviet delegation: Yevgeniy Pavlovich Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and Academician Georgiy Arkadiyevich Arbatov, director of the United States of America and Canada institute.

[Arbatov] I have noticed that there are many arguments going on here: Is this meeting important, or isn't it? Can we expect very much from it, or not? I think that, I am convinced, that this is a very important meeting, and one should expect a very great deal from it. What is being resolved today? What is being resolved, in point of fact, is whether the dialogue at the summit level will continue or not. The meeting in Reykjavik is not a symptom of an improvement in U.S.-Soviet relations but rather evidence of the huge concern over their bad state. In Geneva, it seemed to us that an important step forward had already been made, and it was an important step. But, nevertheless, what happened after Geneva did not give the opportunity of convening a full-size summit meeting in Washington, and that is why the idea of Reykjavik arose. The main item on the agenda is arms limitation, the reduction and the giving up of nuclear arms by the year 2000. And at the moment the whole problem is reflected and highlighted in the issue of stopping nuclear tests, and on this I turn to my colleague, Yevgeniy Velikhov.

[Velikhov] Thank you. The most important accords during the summit-level meeting in Geneva were the following accords: first, the fact that nuclear war cannot be won, and by the same token, that it cannot be waged either; the fact that there cannot be any striving for military supremacy by either of the participating states. The most important specific step in this direction, which demonstrates real progress, is the moratorium on nuclear tests.

Together with the preparatory work that was carried out up to 1980 on the conclusion of a treaty on a total end to nuclear tests, it opens up a real chance and a real opportunity for concluding a treaty immediately, and stopping all nuclear tests. What concerns us is the fact that the Government of the United States has changed by 180 degrees its attitude to a total nuclear test ban treaty, which has always been an important element in the policy of previous administrations.

No less important is the second aspect of this same problem, which is the fact that the Government of the United States, in effect, has equally radically changed its attitude to the issue of verification and the fulfillment of a total nuclear test ban treaty. The impression is that today it is indeed the United States that does not want to achieve here the possibility of a result in principle -- ie., the demonstration and the use of all resources for the reliable verification of this treaty. [passage omitted]

[Zorin] The world is closely following the Reykjavik meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Ronald Reagan, President of the United States. Some people, judging by some obvious and ill-intentioned rumours being spread here, would like to present this meeting as a familiarization, almost a protocol meeting. In the meantime, it is quite obvious that it is a question here of an event of the most important political significance, on the results of which a good deal depends both in the further development of Soviet-U.S. relations and in the whole progress of world political process.

COMMENTARY ON MEETING'S PROSPECTS, PROCEEDINGS

PRAVDA on Eve of Talks

PM102339 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Oct 86 First Edition p 4

["PRAVDA special correspondents T. Kolesnichenko and A. Maslennikov dispatch from Iceland": "On the Eve"]

[Text] The moment the whole world has been waiting for is approaching. M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, arrived here today on a special flight. U.S. President R. Reagan's aircraft landed a day earlier at the airfield in Keflavik. They will meet tomorrow.

In accordance with the plan agreed by the sides, which for the time being is still of a preliminary nature, three working meetings are scheduled -- two on 11 October and one on 12 October. To the disappointment of many journalists, the talks will be confidential. But, as one of the Soviet experts remarked in answer to questions from representatives of the press: "When surgeons are busy with a very complex operation, they should hardly break off in order to tell those around them how things are going."

And here are the details of protocol: R. Reagan will be "host" at the first and third sessions, M.S. Gorbachev will be "host" at the second. When officials were asked what this means, they replied that the "host" arrives first and comes out to greet the "guest." Questions were also asked about how long the tete-a-tete meetings [vstrechi s glazu na glaz] would last. And at the moment this is not yet absolutely clear. The participants in the meeting themselves, it is thought here, will have to decide this according to the precedent of Geneva.

There, as is known, about 20 minutes were allotted for the first conversation -- half an hour at the most. But in fact they lasted 1 hour and 15 minutes. Moreover, such one-to-one meetings [vstrechi nayedine] subsequently became the main form of dialogue between the two leaders. Out of the approximately 15 hours of talks between the Soviet and American sides, the personal conversations between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan took up at that time a total of 6 hours. So it is rather early to hazard guesses.

In recent days there have been many pronouncements in Washington about the forthcoming meeting and, to put it bluntly, they have been extremely contradictory ones. There have also been positive ones among them. White House spokesman Speakes, for instance, assured journalists that "basically the President is prepared for the meeting." Alluding to the experience of the Geneva talks, he declared that the White House incumbent "will be open to discussion and compromises." President R. Reagan himself, before flying off to Reykjavik, spoke about a desire to achieve progress in overcoming disagreements between East and West, to strengthen security, and to preserve peace. Well, that sounds encouraging.

But the time for words is over. And so now an urgent meeting on Icelandic soil was indeed needed because the accords reached in Geneva had been hanging in midair and the negotiations on very important disarmament problems were heading for an impasse. It is no accident that at the latest press conference at the Soviet press center many journalists asked with alarm whether one could expect an agreement to be reached on ending nuclear tests and on a substantial reduction of nuclear arsenals. Yes, these are important questions, but they must be put first and foremost to the American side.

The Soviet Union has come to the meeting in Reykjavik prepared to make the most earnest efforts to resolve these problems. Our country has to its credit not only a package of proposals on all the main disarmament issues but also practical actions in this direction -- above all the moratorium on nuclear explosions that has now continued for 14 months. The idea of all-embracing security put forward by the Soviet Union primarily implies material guarantees for peace and the assertion of the principles of civilized, correct intercourse between states. The Soviet Union rejects the concept according to which security can be guaranteed with the aid of the invention of increasingly sophisticated means of warfare. It is precisely such a "philosophy" which forms the foundation of the ever accelerating arms race.

The ending of nuclear test could undoubtedly halt the arms race in the main and most dangerous direction. The question of reducing the strategic nuclar arms currently stockpiled has long been ripe, although it is perfectly obvious that this step would become meaningless and could even prove counterproductive if an accord were not reached at the same time on averting an arms race in space, as will inevitably happen if Washington's so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" is implemented. Finally, the peoples of Europe and the whole world would heave a sigh of relief if Reykjavik succeeded in reaching an agreement on starting the elimination of medium-range nuclear arms on our continent.

"I, like millions of my fellow countrymen, greeted with great satisfaction the news of the Soviet-American meeting in Reykjavik," one of us was told by the mayor of the Scottish city of Glasgow, Robert Gray. "However, this fact in itself is not enough. People throughout the world expect from the upcoming negotiations progress primarily in the sphere of real disarmament and the strengthening of international peace. One would like to hope that the U.S. Administration will display sufficient statesmanship to finally give a positive reply to the Soviet peace initiatives and, above all, agree to establish a moratorium on nuclear tests."

At the same time it is quite obvious that far from everyone shares such a constructive approach to the forthcoming negotiations. In the last few days at the daily press conferences given by the Soviet side, Western journalists have been posing many questions which reflect their approach to the forthcoming meeting. In place of the discussion of serious businesslike issues at the meeting they would like the forthcoming discussion to be reduced to clash between political "supergladiators." The thing is put in such a way that the slightest advance in Reykjavik depends, they say, only on concessions by the Soviet Union.

Tomorrow sees the moment when everything superficial and secondary must be cast aside. Real prospects have emerged as a result of the preparation for the Reykjavik meeting. There is a whole range of compromise proposals from our side. It should not be said that in the U.S. proposals, too, there is no grain of reason. Specific options must be discussed at the meeting, and, one must believe, fundamental [printsipialnyye], political decisions can be taken on them.

Speaking about the agenda for the meeting, some U.S. observers here stress such problems as human rights and regional conflicts. No one is denying that these problems can be discussed. What is more, we have much that we could say to the United Staes on this score. Replying to those Western journalists who are trying to kick up a fuss around contrived violations of human rights in the USSR, one Soviet expert stated: "We resolve all issues relating to the observance of human rights in accordance with existing legislation and the principles of humanity. As for the situation in the United States, we were going to begin compiling a list of unemployed and homeless people in that country, but it proved to be so long we had to abandon the effort."

It is not the originators of such questions who make the climate here. Among the people arriving in Iceland right now one must primarily mention the representatives of American antiwar movements, whose "baggage" contains the real messages of the American people. Specifically, for instance, one can mention the "Citizens Against Nuclear War" organization. Its leader, Karen (Mulkhauzer), stated outright: "We want President Reagan to announce here, in Reykjavik, a ban on nuclear tests."

Against such a background the Reykjavik meeting opens tomorrow. It is awaited with hope by some people and with uncertainty as to its success by others. We await it with hope.

President R. Reagan -- the "host" of the first meeting -- has said that he is "ready to go the extra mile" to achieve mutual understannding with M.S. Gorbachev. We have not been able to ascertain the distance from the U.S. Embassy, where the U.S. President has established himself, to the Hofdi villa, but whatever the political distance is between these two points will become clear during 11 and 12 October.

PRAVDA 13 Oct Dispatch

PM121851 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Oct 86 First Edition pp 1, 4

[Special correspondents T.Kolesnichenko and A. Maslennikov dispatch: "Answerable to the World"]

[Excerpts] Reykjavik -- The meeting between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan began here today at the villa Hodfi, on the shore of Reykjavik Bay, 11 October. [passage omitted]

The time was almost 1030. Motorcades with the Soviet and U.S. leaders approached one after the other. "Good morning, Mikhail Sergeyevich!", one of the Western correspondents called in Russian. "What can you tell us?" "Let's not rush ahead," M.S. Gorbachev replied with a smile.

The meeting opened with a conversation between the two leaders in the villa's small first-story lounge whose windows overlook Reykjavik Bay. Seated in leather armchairs, the participants in the meeting exchanged impressions of their stay on Icelandic soil. This is my first visit to Iceland," Mikhail Sergeyevich said. "It is an interesting country. Reykjavik is a nice modern city."

The journalists left the premises. The Soviet and U.S. leaders were left alone to discuss the main questions for whose sake they have arrived here in Iceland. As prearranged, the first meeting lasted 2 hours. For about 1 hour the conversation was held face to face. The foreign ministers were invited in later.

The meeting between the USSR and U.S. leaders is being held on a confidential basis. Journalists are therefore left to speculate on the specifics being discussed at the villa Hofdi and how the conversation is developing. But there can be no doubt about the questions whose solution is expected by the world. [passage omitted]

The Soviet side -- and this is the general consensus -- approached the Teykjavik meeting with utmost responsibility. There is no doubt about the serious nature of our intentions to clear the way toward the strengthening of universal peace. But the course of the meeting will depend, of course, also on what the U.S. side will place on the negotiating table. And so far there have been some aspects which provoke caution.

Despite the agreement reached on the meeting's confidential nature, White House Spokesman L. Speakes in essence outlined publicly the U.S. delegation's platform on the main questions of the talks. He even informed journalists what the President will be saying "if there is disagreement" and so on. Since L. Speakes has embarked on revelations, we deem it permissible to express our own opinion on the matter. The U.S. delegation is again proposing to return to the problem of ratification and the question of "verifcation" [kontrol] of the 1974 and 1976 treaties on the limitation of nuclear tests. But the problem of the "threshold" treaties, setting upper limits on kilkotons, is yesterday's problem; now there must be talk not about "thresholds," not about test yields, but about a total test ban. And attemptss to substitute one problem for another are nothing but a maneuver, a desire to divert talks from real and actual problems and really set back the discussion of the question. But it is no good flogging dead horses.

Nevertheless, every cloud has a silver lining, as the saying goes. Despite all the aforementioned, the U.S. side has willy-nilly shown that priority at the present meeting in Reykjavik lies with disarmament problems. This was confirmed by the fact that two "working groups" have been set up here at the Soviet-U.S. meeting. The first is the arms control group. The second group has been assigned all the other questions -- humanitarian, regional, and bilateral relations.

It is here that movement [podvizhka] is mainly needed for the Geneva agreements to materialize. This idea was emphasized in statements made in our press center by Soviet delegation experts Academicians G.A. Arbatov and Ye.P. Velikhov. What obstructs progress in this urgent matter? [paragraph continues]

Primarily the fact that Washington has not given up the idea of military superiority over the Soviet Union. After all, a nuclear test ban would become the main brake on the creation [sozdaniye] of new and increasingly sophisticated mass destruction weapon systems like, for example, X-ray lasers for the SDI program, new warheads, and other systems which are so destructive that people would rather not advertise them publicly. The Soviet experts also refuted the "argument" used by Washington to justify its stance on nuclear tests: Tests are apparently necessary to maintain nuclear weapons in readiness and for as long as these weapons exist, it is claimed, they must be tested, otherwise they will become obsolete. "Seventy percent of Soviet and U.S. missiles with a nuclear charge [nachinka] in excess of 150 kilotons," the Soviet expert said, "have not been tested since 1975, and for some reason this does not worry anyone." [passage omitted]

Representatives of many antiwar organizations, in particular from the United States, Italy, Sweden, and other countries, are here in Reykjavik. A.F. Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received representatives of three of the largest U.S. organizations -- the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, the National Nuclear Weapons Freeze Campaign, and the international organization "Women for a Productive Summit Meeting."

The results of the talks are awaited impatiently in Reykjavik.

Zorin On 'Sensible Approach'

LD120054 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 11 Oct 86

[Political observer Valentin Zorin report from Reykjavik]

[Text] A group of Soviet and American newsmen, myself included, were given the opportunity of seeing the Soviet and American leaders meet. Both the President and the general secretary looked fine. Both sides have agreed to conduct the talks confidentially and not to comment on them until the end. This of course places much responsibility on us newsmen.

Some American correspondents claim that by agreeing to the Reykjavik meeting the President has given into the Russians and that the meeting contitutes a victory for Moscow. What does this mean? Does it mean that every step toward improving Soviet-American relations and ending the dangerous and ruinous arms race runs counter to the interests of the United States and every attempt to lessen the threat of war constitutes an American defeat? However, it's an open secret that there are people in the United States and in the administration itself who are trying their best to make the dialogue a failure. But the most important thing, at least for the present, that a more sensible approach to the situation has taken the upper hand in Washington [sentence as heard]. Of course, it would be naive to expect that the talks that have begun today will undo all the knots of the difficult problems dividing our two countries. But one thing is certain, that with the goodwill of both sides it'll be possible to make important steps in the needed direction.

Vorontsev on U.S. Summit

LD112211 Belgrade TANJUG in English 2041 GMT 11 Oct 86

[Text] Paris, Oct 11 (TANJUG) -- The two-day U.S.-Soviet "inter-summit" in Reykjavik cannot substitute by any means 'Gorbachev's visit to the United States,' assesses First Deputy of the Soviet Foreign Ministry Vorontsev in tomorrow's edition of the paper LE MONDE.

Vorontsev, until recently Soviet ambassador in Paris, writes next that the Reykjavik encounter should "open the road" to Gorbachev's later visit to Washington to bring about concrete "results which are expected by millions of people throughout the world."

In assessing that Europe has been searching increasingly hard for solutions to the general security problems, Vorontsev said the "path towards greater security in Europe" leads via the dismantling of medium-range missiles, reductions in conventional arms and armed forces in Europe, elimination of chemical weapons, and transformation of the Mediterranean into a zone of peace.

GORBACHEV ADDRESSES NEWS CONFERENCE ON OUTCOME

Television Version

LD122343 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1955 GMT 12 Oct 86

[News conference addressed by CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on 12 October -- live]

[Text] [Gorbachev] Good evening ladies, gentlemen, and comrades. I welcome all of those taking part in the news conference. I think that about an hour has gone by since our conference, our meeting with U.S. President Reagan ended. It lasted somewhat longer than we planned. Our business required that to be the case and in this connection I would like to apologize to you for not arriving in time for the news conference fixed for 1800.

You know that this meeting between the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union took place on the initiative of the leadership of the USSR, but naturally it could not have taken place without agreement to such a meeting on the part of Mr. Reagan. Therefore I would say that it was our joint decision to hold this meeting.

It has now ended. It is sometimes said that things cannot be seen when one gets too close. I have just come from the meeting which, especially in the last stage saw heated discussions and I am still under the influence of these discussions and of the impressions left by these discussions. Nonetheless I shall try at this first meeting of ours to sort out what happened and not just share my impressions.

And yet I think these will be first impressions, first appraisals, a first analysis. This whole meeting will still have to be appraised. A major meeting has taken place, and you will sense this when I tell you about the content of the problems which were the subject of a very broad, very intensive, very interested discussion.

The atmosphere at the meeting was friendly. We had an opportunity to set out our views on different problems freely and, I would say, without constraint and this made it possible for us to deepen our understanding of many major problems of world politics, of bilateral relations, and primarily on the burning problems which are at the center of attention of the whole of the world public -- questions of war and peace, of ending the nuclear arms race, the whole set of questions which are embraced by this subject.

Before I go over to a direct description of the meeting itself, the content of the discussions, the proposals of the sides and the results of this meeting, I want to say, to explain to you, since I have not yet had the opportunity, why we in fact came out with the initative on holding this meeting.

I read the world press regularly, and I felt recently when the decision to hold the meeting was made, what a broad reaction this announcement provoked, the announcement of the meeting. Much has been said about both the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the U.S. President. But haven't they been a bit hasty? Is it necessary? And who yielded to whom, and who outplayed whom? And so on.

You know, the grounds which served as the initial factor for our proposing to the U.S. President an urgent meeting and for the decision of the President, Mr. Reagan, to respond to this meeting positively, are very significant, very significant.

I want to return now to Geneva. When we met there it was major dialogue, a major meeting, and now, after more than a little time has passed, we evaluate it as such. Then, if you remember, we acknowledged the special responsibility of the USSR and the United States to preserve peace, and stated jointly that nuclear war must never be unleashed and that there can be no winners in it. This is an acknowledgement of immense importance. We also stated that neither side would strive to achieve military superiority, and this is also a very important statement of mutual understanding of this problem.

Almost a year has passed since Geneva. We consider that the Soviet leadership has remained loyal to the pledges it made in Geneva. Having returned from Geneva, we extended our moratorium. It was valid until 1 January of this year. On 15 January we made a major statement substantiating the plan for the liquidation of nuclear arms by the end of this century. I would like to say, returning to the moratorium, that for 14 months our test grounds have been quiet; this is evidence of our adherence to the accords of Geneva and of our responsibility for the fate of the world, because all these are not easy decisions if one takes into consideration the fact that during this period blasts have been continuing in Nevada, and are taking place today as well.

Last June Warsaw Treaty states put forward a major comprehensive plan for a large-scale reduction of conventional arms and armed forces in Europe. This is also a major step, given the concern voiced both by the Europeans and the United States, who are their allies -- I mean the European states of the West, of Western Europe.

Having learned the lessons from the Chernobyl tragedy, we have put forward major proposals on the necessity of an extraordinary session of the IAEA in Vienna. It took place, and you know the results. They are very promising. We now have an international mechanism that makes it possible to resolve many questions in the importanct sphere of nuclear power safety.

In other words, we are now, as we understand it -- and I do not believe I am exaggerating in my assessment of our policies, for I am not speaking simply of intentions, but of facts -- we have been doing all we can to aid the formation of a new way of thinking in the cuclear age. I want to express our satisfaction that the shoots of this new way of thinking seem to be coming up in the European cornfield, too; this has been shown, in particular, in the success of Stockholm.

Perhaps I will end here the list of specific actions we have carried out, taking as our starting point the spirit and the letter of the accord with President Reagan in Geneva.

Since I am speaking of facts, I believe that the facts now permit us -- you and us -- to appraise them, and you will agree, of course, that this is evidence of a serious approach to the Geneva accords.

Nonetheless, I am now coming to the reason why we put forward the initiative for the meeting in Reykjavik. The hopes for major changes in the world atmosphere, which we all had after Geneva after our meeting with Mr Reagan -- I would put it this way in a more cautious manner, perhaps -- began to dissipate, and not without reason, I think. Above all, this is because of the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva -- during which generally speaking, very much has been said, as I told the President yesterday -- 50 to 100 variants on a way to curb the arms race and start reducing nuclear weapons have been doing the rounds. This alone creates doubt that fruitful discussions are taking place there. I think that you and I are people who are, as they say, in the know. If there had been one, two, or even three variants, that would have been something. That would mean that the focus of the talks had been narrowed and the search would have been concentrated on some important areas that had been pinpointed. This search would have ended with some specific agreements and proposals to the governments.

Nothing of the sort is happening in Geneva, at the principal forum of world politics. Furthermore, I tell you bluntly, of late these talks have been marking time and have virtually entered an impasse. The arms race has not stopped. And, moreover, we see clearly that we are all approaching a new boundary, after which a new spiral in the arms race with unpredictable consequences, political and military, is unavoidable.

Our initiatives, of which I was speaking in particular at the start of my speech, have, in general met with a broad response among the world public. But they did not meet with due understanding of the U.S. Administration.

The situation has worsened. Once again alarm has started to grow in the world. Yet I think that I shall not, I do not exaggerate -- and you are the living witnesses, representing all continents of our earth -- that in general the world is seething. The world is seething and demanding of the leaders of all countries, and above all of the major powers, and in the first instance of the USSR and the United States, the demonstration of political will, resolve, in order to stop the trends which lead to danger, to unpredictable consequences. It is necessary to do something in order to break the chain of events, to erect a barrier.

We have reached the conclusion that a new impulse is necessary, a powerful impulse for new processes, new approaches, above all at the Geneva talks. In our view such impulses are only able to result at the level of a meeting of the leaders of the USSR and the United States. This is why, in answering the letter from President Reagan, his letter of 25 July, I decided to invite him to meet without delay. I said that the situation was such that it was necessary for us to postpone all engagements for a day or two and to meet, without delay and according [appears to change thought] and said that I awaited a speedy reply.

This letter was passed on by Comrade Shevardnadze to the President. And so the extraordinarily important meeting -- or however we would describe it -- was held. We assumed that much depended on this meeting, bearing in mind our estimation of it, that had prompted us to take this step. And of course when we came to the meeting it was not with empty hands.

So what did we bring to Reykjavik? We brought here a whole package of major proposals which, if adopted, could, indeed, in a short time, and regarding all aspects of the struggle for disarmament, for limiting nuclear weapons, really remove the threat of nuclear war and make it possible to start moving toward a nonnuclear world. I proposed to the President that right here in Reykjavik we should give binding instructions to our ministers or other appropriate departments to prepare three draft agreements that we could then sign subsequently, during my visit to the United States.

First: on strategic weapons. We submitted a proposal to make a reduction of 50 percent, no less -- incidentally on the assumption of totally eliminating this most lethal form of weapon by the end of the century.

We proceeded from the fact that the world is awaiting really major steps, deep reductions, and not any cosmetic steps, so to speak, only to assuage public opinion for a certain period. We have simply come to a time when bold, responsible actions, in the interests of the whole world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union and the United States, are needed. Of course the Soviet-U.S. delegation, the delegations which would have been set the task of preparing this document, were to achieve well- and honestly-balanced reductions in the structures of strategic armed forces that have come about historically. This concerns the very same triad which was recognized right back at the time of the drawing-up of and preparations for SALT II. There is already an agreed concept, an idea on this subject. When we began to discuss this question with the President, what came over in response were unfitting, far from appropriate proposals which the President and his entourage had brought with them. Here again everything that had figured at the Geneva talks was brought out: all the levels, sublevels, a lot of arithmetic, in order to confuse the essence of the question.

We listened to all of this, and then we put this clarification into our proposals: You and we both have what is recognized as a triad of strategic offensive weapons: land-based strategic missiles, strategic missiles on submarines, and strategic missiles -- rather strategic bombers, strategic aircraft with nuclear weapons. So today we have equal numbers of them in the Soviet Union and in America. Let us cut all of this by 50 percent: 50 percent of the land-based missiles, including heavy missiles, which the United States is so worried about; 50 percent of the strategic missiles on submarines; and 50 percent of the strategic aircraft.

The American delegation agreed to this. So we came to an agreement. And in making this proposal -- we are well informed people, I am just reminding you, so that you will have it fresh in your minds -- we have made serious concessions. You remember that when we put this proposal forward in Geneva we made it a question of a 50 percent cut in weapons that can reach each other's territory, and all of this was considered strategic. But now we removed the question of medium-range missiles, we removed the question of forward-based weapons -- that is, we embarked on an important concession on the most vital question.

That is the first point. The second point is that we proposed that an agreement on medium-range missiles be prepared. I proposed to the President renouncing all the options discussed hitherto -- interim, temporary, and so on -- and returning to the U.S. proposal to eliminate completely U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe and Soviet missiles in Europe.

Trying to bring the U.S. side to see the need to adopt an agreement such as our proposal, we had already previously proposed in Geneva that we should leave aside, as it were, the existing balance, the strategic potential of France and Britain, and we asked only that it should not be further improved or increased. That did not suit the U.S. side. We decided today, at this meeting today, to cut out completely the issue of French and British missiles in general -- to put it aside. Let them remain as an independent force; let them increase and be further improved, although you understand this is a very major potential and will indeed be increased and is an organic part of NATO's nuclear potential. This potential is taken into consideration when all plans are being made for all operations. We know that for a fact. I think that 99 percent of all those present can also say that that is the case. But if 1 percent is not convinced of this today then it must urgently get rid of that shortcoming. We cut this issue out.

There was anxiety about Asia. Fine, then let us agree, let us get down to talking about Asia immediately. Let us explain our anxiety and find a solution.

Anxiety came out in connection with the fact that on the side of the Warsaw Pact organization there are missiles with a range of less than 1,000 kilometers, which can fly less than 1,000 km. We proposed, recognizing this anxiety, too, that we freeze these missiles immediately and enter talks on their fate. That is how far we went. I do not think even the Americans themselves expected that of us. A discussion began.

But it turns out this is bad again, it does not suit the American side again; they have begun once again to invite us to agree to intermediate options, to keep the American missiles in Europe, and the Soviet one in Europe, or some part of them. There could be a compensatory amount of Asia. In general, much was said.

We said to the President of the United States: Mr. President, we cannot understand how you can renounce your brainchild, the zero option, which you yourself proposed and which we are putting forward now in order to meet you halfway, recognizing the concerns and taking these concerns into account in our proposals.

In the end the discussion lasted until today, a sharp [ostraya] discussion, and we took the final step. We stated that we were prepared for the following version: We shall eliminate American and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe. On Missiles with a range of under 1,000 km we shall freeze them and start talks. And in Asia we shall have 100 warheads of medium missiles and, correspondingly, the United States will have 100 warheads on its territory. We also reached agreement to sign such an agreement on this. This would suit everyone, I think -- the Soviet Union too, even though it is altogether again a major concession and is not so easy for us to accept. But we must start moving. I have mentioned this more than once: What is needed are bold, original decisions. If we take the advice of past experience all the time, experience that belongs to a completely different time, without taking into account where we are today and where we will be tomorrow and the possibility that tomorrow we may be completely unable to start a dialogue -- particularly a dialogue on these burning questions that worry the whole world -- then we just have to start somewhere.

We have started out on this, understanding that these were no easy decisions for us. It was -- we reached agreement on this question.

Regarding the fact that we are ready to make deep cuts in strategic offensive arms and to get rid of the nuclear potential of medium-range missiles, we put the issue like this: If we are entering a concrete stage, the actual elimination of nuclear weapons, then there must be at least complete clarity for both sides on two questions: first, monitoring. Now that we are embarking on this stage, we support triple monitoring, monitoring that can provide complete confidence on each side that nothing can happen that would let us down, so that it could turn out to be trapped, ensnared. We are for any form of monitoring and are ready to reach agreement on this. This question was removed from the table in view of this position of ours. And we shall indeed now strive for such monitoring, if we embark on this path.

And the second issue: If we are starting to undertake the practical liquidation of nuclear arms, strategic potential, and medium-range missiles, then an issue arises that each side must have a guarantee that in that period neither side must do anything to achieve a military advantage and obtain the right to dictate. I think this is a very just and logical formulation both from the political and military point of view. From the political viewpoint, if we begin to reduce armaments, then we must take care that all the obstacles that exist today and stand in the way of the creation of new types of weapons, have to be not only preserved but also strengthened. Is this a correct formulation? It is indeed both correct and logical. From the military viewpoint it is indeed necessary to ensure that it does not happen that both sides reduce their nuclear potential, but while the reduction is in progress one side secretly seizes the initiative and achieves military superiority. This is inadmissible. I say this with regard to the Soviet Union, but we also have the right to demand this from the American side.

In this connection we put the issue this way: In this situation when we come to the stage of a real, profound reduction and then in 10 years -- and this was how the whole situation appeared to us at the meeting today on the specific points -- we concluded that in 10 years we should be able to liquidate the nuclear potential of the Soviet Union and the United States of America; and during this period it is necessary not only to weaken the mechanisms, primarily those such as the ABM treaty, that hold the arms race back, but to strengthen these mechanisms. Our proposal boiled down to the following: that we strengthen the open-ended ABM treaty by having the sides make identical pledges that in the next 10 years they will not use their right to abandon this treaty. These are the very 10 years when the reduction of the nuclear potential will be taking place. Is this a correct, logical formulation? It's logical. Is it a serious formulation?. It is. Does it match the interests of both sides? It does.

At the same time we stressed in our proposal that in this period of 10 years all the requirements of the ABM treaty should be strictly observed, that the development [razrabotka] and tests of space weapons should be banned, and that only laboratory research and tests are allowed. What did we mean by this.

We know the attachment of the U.S. Administration and President to SDI. The possibility of our consent to the continuation of and to the possibility of laboratory tests gives the President the opportunity to consummate research and elucidate what SDI is and what kind of an animal it is, although for many people, us included, it is already clear what it is.

And this is where, comrades, a real row started, concerning the two approaches of world politics, including on such questions as the stopping of the arms race and the banning of nuclear weapons.

The U.S. Administration, the President, insisted to the end that America should have the right to test, research and test, everything that relates to SDI not only in laboratories but also beyond, including in space. Well, who would agree to that? A madman!

But madmen are usually where they should be, for treatment. At any rate, I don't see them in leading positions, especially at the helm of states. And to think we were on the verge of taking major historic decisions, for hitherto it was only a question of limitation: We had taken the ABM, SALT I, SALT II, and so forth, decisions.

And the U.S. Administration, as we now realize, having come to believe in its technological advantage, is trying to cut its way through SDI, to military superiority; it has even gone so far as to bury the accords, when we had already agreed that all that remained was to sign them, that we only had to make, and give, instructions for the treaties to be drafted, practical instructions as to how they should be implemented, and everything could have been signed in Washington. It disrupted all that.

I told the President we were missing a historic opportunity. Never before have our positions been so close. The President, saying goodbye to me, said he was disappointed and that from the very beginning I came, had intended, no doubt, had come with an unwillingness to sign these treaties, to find agreement, accord. Why do you on account of one word display such hardness in your approach, so to speak, to anything to do with SDI and the problem of tests, with the understanding of these problems?

I don't think it's a matter of a word. Not a word, but substance. This is precisely the key to an understanding of what is in the mind of the U.S. Administration.

In my opinion, what it has in mind is -- as I can now see -- what the U.S. military-industrial complex has in mind; -- it is this that is in power, and the President is not free to take such a decision.

We took breaks; discussions were held; and, I see, the President did not receive support. And this is why our meeting was broken off. It failed when we were close to reaching historic results.

Such is the dramatic situation which came about at this meeting. [Here follows 1-minute break in signal from relay, during which Mocow television displays a Reykjavik city scene. Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0600 GMT on 13 October carries a repeat of the statement portion of the Gorbachev news conference. Comparison with the Moscow television version reveals the two to be identical, with the indistinct passage rendered as follows: If you enumerate everything and make a simple list, you will see that we have gone for the most major and unprecedented concessions and compromises that we have ever made. But nonetheless were unable to reach agreement. When the President and I were exchanging opinions,...] ...and even though our dialogue was a difficult one, it nevertheless continued after Geneva, so I told him my point of view in regard to what ought to be the nature of our meeting in the United States during my visit. You are familiar with this point of view.

It is not a condition, but it is rather an understanding, I think, simply of our responsiblity -- both mine and that of the President -- which dictates how the future meeting in Washington should be approached.

We need a successful meeting; it should really lead to perceptible results and fundamental changes, and steps, and especially in such a burning issue as nuclear arms control, the prevention of the arms race and the elimination of nuclear weapons.

I told him in letters, and said to him at our meeting: You and I, Mr President, must not allow our meeting in Washington to fail. This is why I advocated an urgent meeting between us -- we do indeed have something constructive to put forward in order to come to an agreement and go into the Washington meeting with serious proposals and serious solutions.

If we were to meet in Washington, I could not for a moment allow myself to let that meeting fail. If it did, what would people think, in general, in the USSR, in the United States and throughout the world? And what does this say about the politicians who head two such huge states, and who to a great extent determine the fate of the whole world? Here they are meeting, they write to each other, they are having their third meeting, and they cannot agree with each other about anything. That, I consider, would be a simply scandalous outcome, with unforeseeable consequences. We simply cannot allow it. This would arouse disappointment throughout the world, and not only in our countries.

So, in fact, it is the plan for having a meeting in Washington, the question of how we are to hold it, and with what results, that pushed us toward the initiative of holding a working meeting here in Iceland, in Reykjavik, in order to get things clear in a businesslike way, to listen to each other attentively, to try to find mutual points of contact, and in general to find common approaches which would be in the interests of our two countries, in the interests of our allies and the peoples of all countries.

All the same, the Americans have come to this meeting bare- and empty-handed, with a moth-balled collection, as they say, that the Geneva talks are already stifling. We, as you can see, in order to break through this situation, to open up the way, to take this process through to a new stage, and to really resolve the issues, have put forward these proposals.

So I have told you what happened.

What is to be done? The United States remains as a reality. The Soviet Union remains as a reality. Some hero of one of our Russian writers wanted to close America, but he couldn't manage it. We are free of this complex. America is a reality -- and what a reality! The Soviet Union, I consider, is also an impressive reality.

I think now that we and the Americans must think over, and world public opinion must think over the current situation in the world on the main issue which is a matter of concern to the peoples of all countries -- the question of war and peace, the question of the threat of nuclear war.

I think that I am not exaggerating when I say that everything that we proposed to the President meets the interests of both the U.S. people and the peoples of all countries. If it is not in someone's interest then we are entitled altogether today: Let them listen to what the U.S. people, the Soviet people, and peoples of all countries are demanding. I arrived for this meeting here and said that the time for action has come. It turned out that these words were prophetic; it really is a time for action, and none of us must waste time.

We shall act, we shall not deviate from our policy for peace, the struggle against the arms race, for the banning of nuclear weapons, for the scrapping of nuclear weapons, for averting the nuclear threat from the whole of our planet. And I think we shall not be alone in this fight.

Well, I have said to you everything that I can say to you right now, immediately after our meeting. Obviously I could say more, if I had the opportunity to think over more everything that has happened. But it seems to me that I have expressed myself completely lucidly and specifically on all matters. At the moment I am not talking about the fact that we touched upon many other matters.

We talked about humanitarian matters, and came onto specific problems here as well. There was an exchange of opinions. Two groups were set up, two working groups, which you probably knew about. The first one on military matters, let us say, was headed on our side by Marshal of the Soviet Union Akhromeyev, chief of the General Staff. And on the U.S. side who headed the group? Nitze. Paul Nitze. They worked for 10 hours and 20 minutes, all night. A group on humanitarian issues was working, headed on our side by Deputy Foreign Minister Bessmertnykh, and on the U.S. side, by Assistant Secretary of State Mrs Ridgway.

They also had an interesting exchange. And this -- certain accords which were achieved there -- could become an integral part of the final document. But since the main thing collapsed, the entire process has halted.

As you see, the meeting was, generally an interesting, important meeting, promising much. But for the time being it finished the way I have described. We will not despair. I think that this meeting has brought us to a very important stage, an important stage in understanding where we are. And it showed that accords are possible, possible. I am convinced of this.

Thank you for your attention.

After such a detailed speech, such an address, are there still going to be questions? There will be? Well, let's go, let's sit until dawn! Yes, please, you.

[Czechoslovak correspondent] Czechoslovak television, Peter Kucera. Esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich, I have the following question: You have said that a great chance was missed here in Reykjavik. When, in your opinion, can a new chance arise?

[Gorbachev] You know that I would give an optimistic answer to that because much has already been done, both on the eve of the meeting and at the meeting itself. If we, from realistic positions both in the United States, in the White House, and in our country, in the Soviet leadership, think through everything once again and show realism and responsibility, then the opportunity to resolve these issues is not yet lost. [Gorbachev turns to another correspondent] Japan, if I am not mistaken.

[Japanese television correspondent] Japanese television, NHK. Does this mean that the dialogue with the United States, with the Reagan administration, is still continuing, or do you think that very little opportunity remains for a good dialogue with Reagan?

[Gorbachev] I think that at the moment the need for dialogue has grown even more, no matter how difficult it may be. [Gorbachev turns to another correspondent] Yes, please, Well, I do not know you. What is your surname? Ah, Kolesnichenko! I've read you a great deal, but you have lived mainly in America, so that is why I do not know you!

[Kolesnichenko] Mikhail Sergeyevich, what do you think: Why has the U.S. Administration decided to wreck the talks, making an irresponsible decision that ignores world public opinion?

[Gorbachev] I think America has yet to make itself clear. I think it has not yet made itself clear, and we felt this was seen in the President's position. [Gorbachev turns to another correspondent] Yes, please.

[Australian radio correspondent -- in English followed by Russian translation] General Secretary, (Mark Coleman) from the Australian Broadcasting Corporation. You described Mr Reagan as being in the grip of the military-industrial complex. Does this mean that this is (?the cause) of what happened today, and that in the future the United States will still not be able to achieve great successes in his field?

[Gorbachev] For all that the military industrial complex represents today, and for all the weight that it has in America as it is today, we shall not overestimate its capabilities. I have always been a supporter of the approach and evaluation that says that the people have the decisive word in any country, and this includes the American people. [Gorbachev turns to another correspondent] Yes, I promised you.

[Unidentified correspondent, first words not picked up by microphone; question in English; with Russian translation following] As far as the negative result of the meeting is concerned, does this mean that the Soviet Union will go on fighting the development of fresh space programs?

[Gorbachev] I think you have understood the meaning of the Soviet position, that if we have now reached a stage of beginning a deep cut in nuclear arms, of both strategic and medium-range missiles, and we and the Americans were already coming to an agreement that we would do this over a period of 10 years, then we had the right to demand that we should be guaranteed during this period that nothing unexpected and unforeseen should happen. This includes the sphere of space, too, and the deployment in space of a space ABM system. But -- and perhaps I shall open the curtain a little over our exchange of opinions -- I told the President that the SDI does not worry us from a military point of view. I believe that no one in America believes such a system can be built [sozdat]. Furthermore, we shall have our asymmetric answer if, in the final resort, America decides to go ahead with it. Though I did say to him: Mr President, you know, they've made me your comrade-in-arms over the SDI. He was surprised at this, and I said: It seems that because I criticize the SDI so sharply, this gives you the most convincing argument that the SDI is necessary. You simply say: If Gorbachev is against it, that means it is a good thing, and you get the applause and the financing. But indeed, there are cynics and skeptics who say: Isn't that a cunning ploy by Gorbachev, not to get himself drawn into the SDI, but to reduce America to poverty by it?

Well, you can work it out for yourself. In any case, the SDI does not frighten us. I can tell you this with certainty, because to bluff over such questions is irresponsible. There will be a response. It will not be a symmetrical one. We will not have to sacrifice a lot. But where does its danger lie?

First, a political danger. A situation immediately arises that introduces uncertainty and arouses mistrust of one another and suspicions, and then, you know, there can be no talk of cutting nuclear arms. In brief, we need a completely different situation to be able to engage thoroughly in cutting nuclear arms. That is the first thing.

Second, there is after all a military side. Through the SDI it is possible to arrive at new types of weapons. This, too, we are competent to speak about.

It is possible to come out onto a completely new stage; an arms race which is unpredictable, with serious consequences. So the question is asked: On the one hand we have been negotiating to start reducing nuclear weapons which are the most dangerous and terrible thing today and, on the other hand we are supposed to bless the research, and carry it out in space, on location, in order to discover even more modern weapons. All this surely does not tie up, in terms of normal logic.

We have looked into SDI. Let's give, you, yes, no, yes, yes, please go ahead. One moment please, the next one, after you, the next one, you next, you next.

[WASHINGTON POST correspondent] Mr. General Secretary, I represent WASHINGTON POST in Moscow, I will pose a question in English. [Continues in English followed by translator in Russian] You have just had your second meeting with President Reagan. After days of meetings, what kind of impression have you formed of the President as a political figure? Do you feel that he shares your sense of responsibility for the fate of the world?

[Gorbachev] I have the impression that Mr Reagan and I can continue both the dialogue and engage in a search, after all, for solutions to major, urgent problems, including those of which I have spoken.

Please go ahead.

[Rasmussen, in English followed by translator in Russian] Steve Rassmusen, LAND OG FOLK, Copenhagen. Do the unsatisfactory results of your meeting today mean that progress will not be achieved on the issue of prohibiting nuclear tests and on other issues which were discussed yesterday and today? Is this issue of prohibiting nuclear tests tied up with the other issues which have been considered at these sessions?

[Gorbachev] I think that I have actually already replied to this question. We consider that at this stage, our contacts with the Americans and the President, and especially international relations are not broken off. The search continues and will continue. And I think that what has taken place here in Iceland, in Reykjavik, should all the more become a powerful impulse for us all to sense now that it is necessary to join the common struggle for a normalization of the international situation, for a search for ways to get out of situations of impasse, including those such as have been discussed here in Reykjavik; and, in fact, one such impasse did arise here. I am an optimist. Please go ahead.

[Unidentified speaker] I shall speak louder, without a microphone. [passage indistinct]

[Gorbachev] I think that you have carefully thought out your question, and this is to your credit.

What I always like about our German friends is their accuracy in expression, and of thought. I think that what has taken place in Reykjavik, despite the fact that we have ended our meeting without having reached agreement on the issues toward which, it seems to me, we had found ways of approaching, is sad. It is disappointing.

But I would say that I would not call this meeting unsuccessful. On the contrary it was still a step in the complex and difficult dialogue and in the quest for solutions. To be sure, in general, the solutions that we are seeking are not easy ones. They are the solutions to difficult matters and so let us not sow panic around the world. But at the same time it must be said that the world must know everything that happens so that it does not feel that it is a detached observer. The time has now come for action by all forces.

[ABC correspondent in English followed by Russian translation] ABC correspondent in Moscow, (Rogers). Mr General Secretary, I do not understand why, when you and President Reagan had the opportunity to reach an agreement on reducing nuclear weapons, the Soviet side did not agree to research on SDI and surely you said all the time in Geneva that you are ready to pay a high price for reductions in these weapons. And now when such opportunities were achieved you missed them.

[Gorbachev] Your question contains an element of criticism and so I shall answer it in greater detail. First, the President came empty-handed and with empty pockets. And I would say that the U.S. delegation brought us the trash from the Geneva talks. And it is only thanks to the far-reaching proposals of the Soviet side that we were able to reach very major accords -- they have not been officially drawn up, I should stipulate -- on reducing strategic offensive weapons and on medium-range missiles and, naturally, we hoped that in these conditions -- and I think that this is perfectly understandable to a politician, to a military man and simply to an ordinary person -- that if we sign these two accords on major reductions in nuclear weapons then care should be taken that nothing should happen that might wreck this difficult process which we have been following for decades. And then we posed the question of the fact that we are in favor of consolidating the ABM Treaty all the time. It has already placed SALT II in doubt and now in Reykjavik would like to see the ABM Treaty dead and buried -- and with the participation of the Soviet Union and Gorbachev, furthermore. And that will not happen.

The whole world would not understand us. And I am convinced of this, convinced, and everyone who is seated here, everyone is convinced of this, that if we should go on to start attacking the ABM treaty, the last mechanism that has done so much, after all, to restrain the process of the arms race, then we are not worth anything as politicians. But it is not enough to preserve this. In conditions when deep reductions in nuclear weapons are beginning, we think that this treaty should be strengthened. And we proposed a mechanism for consolidating it, by refraining -- for 10 years, over which we would reduce totally these nuclear, rather eliminate the nuclear potential of our countries -- by refraining from exercising the right to abandon the ABM Treaty. But during that time, too, no one should be tempted, neither the Soviet Union, to overtake America in space research, and, so to speak, break out, gain military superiority, nor should America do likewise with regard to the Soviet Union. We said we favor laboratory research and testing, but oppose taking these researches and testing of ABM system parts -- space ABM systems -- into space. This is our demand. And so our demand in this case was also constructive, mindful of the position of America.

It would receive, so to speak, if it agreed, the possibility, as part of continuing laboratory research, of addressing its questions concerning the implementation of the SDI program; but without going outside that framework and without any attempt to create a space ABM defense. I think that the logic here, as children say, is iron. Sometimes it is necessasy to learn from children, too. Let's go over to the women.

[Unidentified journalist in English with simultaneous Russian translation] In light of what has happened here in the field of human rights, do you intend to share your thoughts at this conference, and maybe tell us some of your thoughts in this field?

[Gorbachev] I think that this humanitarian problem [interrupted by indistinct voice] -- what?

[Unidentified speaker] What initiatives will there be as far as Western Europe is concerned?

[Gorbachev] I didn't understand the translation then. No. Just a minute. What?

[Unidentified correspondent] With regard to Western Europe, does the Soviet Union plan any initiatives, after what has happened in Reykjavik?

[Gorbachev] In the first place, I think that Western Europe hears what I am saying. And if it would think, carefully study what proposals we have submitted, then it would see that these are all the same proposals that are in the interests of Western Europe. We understand that we could take an indifferent attitude to the interests of Western Europe, in which the shoots of a new way of thinking are putting down roots and in which responsibility is growing for the preservation of our European home, for the consolidation of our European home. Now you, please, no, let's hand over to the women again. How difficult it is to get through to a woman!

[NEWSWEEK Moscow correspondent speaking in English, fading into Russian translation] NEWSWEEK Moscow correspondent. I would like to know of the intentions of and possibilities for your coming to Washington. You spoke about the necessity of reaching a number of agreements, especially on issues relating to medium-range missiles. I would like to know whether reaching such an agreement is possible before you visit Washington?

[Gorbachev] I think that in spite of all of today's dramatic tension we have not moved further away from Washington, but rather closer. If the President and the U.S. Administration follow up my invitation to continue studying everything discussed here in Reykjavik, and if the administdration consults those circles it considers necessary to consult in America, then I think that all is not yet lost. Building on what we had here in Reykjavik, possibilities exist for reaching agreements that would make a meeting in Washington realistic and necessary and possible, and it could be a successful one. We have no (?doubts) on that score.

[CNN correspondent speaking in English with superimposed Russian translation] Peter Ryan, Cable News Network. Mr Gorbachev, you said in your speech that President Reagan should think about the situation and consult with Congress and the American people. Do you think that American public opinion will back up the Soviet approach in this regard?

[Gorbachev] Let's wait and see.

[RUDE PRAVO correspondent] [Words indistinct]

[Gorbachev] Welcome to you! We recently had a good meeting.

[RUDE PRAVO] [words indistinct] I have a question for you as a politician and lawyer. What, in your opinion, are the priorities in human rights issues in the nuclear age; and what role can the human factor play in resolving issues of war and peace?

[Gorbachev] You know, you're a real philosopher! [laughter] I can only say that I once studied philosophy, too, and have started to study a bit again now. I think, when we talk about human rights, what we discussed today, first and foremost, was the question of preserving peace and deflecting the nuclear threat from man; that is the supreme priority. There will be peace, there will be life -- we will work it out somehow, because we are sitting here, from all over the world, discussing the most urgent issues. We are people after all. There are more and more educated people in our world, educated peoples. And that is why I think that the peoples will work it all out.

And this is why I say that -- if I understood you correctly -- when we speak of human rights, I should put the individual's right to life first. That is the first thing, and the second -- you mentioned some reverse connection. Can someone remind me? [muttering] Ah -- the human factor, what about it? I think that in a nuclear age -- and it is precisely here that I see a manifestation of the new thinking -- wars, nuclears war and the threat of nuclear war pose the question of the role of the human factor in a new manner in the struggle for peace and preventing war, for today this war will affect everyone, irrespective of where it starts. For this reason it seems to me justified and natural.

Only ill-wishers consider that all antiwar movements, everyone who comes out in defense of peace, are the product of Moscow's intrigues, hirelings or people suborned by socialism and so forth -- this is not serious, and the people are now working things out. If women, children, and men of all ages are rising today and joining hands and demanding an end to this dangerous tendency, when the world is moving toward the threat of nuclear war, I think that movement will grow, and that the role of the human factor is increasing considerably, is growing.

[IZVESTIYA correwspondent] IZVESTIYA, Moscow. There has been much and frequent talk in the White House that the main danger for the United States is the Soviet intercontinental missiles. We proposed in Reykjavik to eliminate this main danger to the United States within 10 years. What is your impression? Why was the other side not ready to remove this main threat from its country?

[Gorbachev] You have very rightly asked this question. It has been used for many years by the U.S. side to show that the Soviet Union is not in a mood to work seriously for disarmament, for the halting of the arms race, that it does not take into account America's concerns, and so on. As you see, we have come down to the matter, and indeed we put the question very sharply. There exists the triad, already recognized, generally recognized by us and by the Americans -- so the whole triad of strategic armed forces should be reduced by 50 percent in the first 5 years. This is a large step. But we at the same time showed and told the Americans that we, too, have our concerns, and particularly on the following score: The fact is that 70 -- or maybe? -- Is that right?

[Unidentified voice] Yes, yes.

[Gorbachev] Tell me, Akhromeyev, 70 percent of strategic forces are stationed on submarines in America, 850 multiple warheads or more?

[Unidentified voice] Six hundred fifty-six.

[Gorbachev] Six hundred fifty-six multiple independently targeted warheads. And after all, submarines sail around the Soviet Union, in all seas and oceans. So from where will it strike? This is even worse than a land-based heavy missile. So, you see, in general this is all talk. When they do not want to resolve questions, they look for problems, obstacles. But these obstacles have been removed, and this is the important thing. And indeed an interesting question is the fact that we have embarked on such a large step, having in addition removed all the problems concerning medium-range missiles which have strategic significance for the United States -- the present Pershings and forward-based weapons. We have taken these out of the equation, so to speak, when it came to resolving the question of strategic missiles. This indicates our good will. But the Americans nevertheless failed to match us. I think -- I'm coming back to this yet again -- that the Americans think they will break out into space and achieve military superiority and will implement the idea of one president who said that he who rules space would rule the earth. We continue to be dealing with imperial ambitions. But the world is not like that. The world does not want to be a fiefdom of the United States. It will not be a fiefdom of the Soviet Union. Each country has the right to make its own choice, for its ideology, for its values. If we do not recognize this then there are no international relations, then there is chaos and law by the fist, you understand. We will never agree to this.

America is probably very nostalgic about the old days when it was mighty while we all emerged from the war weakened. It had both economic and military superiority. There is evidently some nostalgia, but nevertheless, we wish our American partners would accept the realities. This is what they should do, otherwise we will make no progress in the search for correct solutions, if the Americans do not start thinking in today's terms and proceed from present-day realities. [turns to another correspondent]

[Bulgarian television correspondent] Bulgarian television, Comrade Gorbachev. [5-second break in transmission] ... understood you, these talks are not being stopped, and I also understand that the instructions of the Soviet leadership, of the Soviet delegation, will be to find resolutions for the issues that have not yet been resolved.

[Gorbachev] You are right.

[Correspondent] Do you think that the U.S. delegation will be given the same kind of instruction by the U.S. leadership after Reykjavik?

[Gorbachev] I hope so. I hope that this will be so.

[Unidentified correspondent] One would like to draw attention to the European Continent. In what way, in your opinion, will the outcome of the meeting in Reykjavik affect the pan-European process? What will be its fate now?

[Gorbachev] I believe that both politicians and the people of Europe at this very crucial time will be up to the mark. The time calls for action, and not just magniloquent statements not followed by anything concrete. The world is sick and tired of idle talk. The world needs a real process of disarmament, of elimination of nuclear weapons. I think that this tendency will be growing. I am especially hoping for wisdom and a sense of reponsibility on the part of politicians and peoples of Europe. [turns to next correspondent] Go ahead please -- I mean you over there!

[NBC correspondent speaking in English fading into Russian translation] [Name indistinct] NBC news. Am I correct in understanding that you are directly appealing to other members of the international community to act as a lobby in order to force the United States to change its opinion?

[Gorbachev] You know, lobbying is well-developed in your country. We know the way the U.S. political process works. Perhaps that is why the President found it hard to make a decision at this meeting. But when it is a question of strengthening peace, and not simply strengthening it, but of doing something, taking real steps to strengthen it -- when joint efforts are required -- and this concerns everybody, not only the United States and the Soviet Union, I do not think of the lobby system; I think of the sense of responsibility and common sense of the peoples, of an understanding of the asset which is today's peace, and of the need to preserve that peace.

For this reason, when in this case we start calling peoples, movements, or politicians who call for peace -- and this coincides with what we proclaim -- when we start calling them lobbyists for the Soviet Union, I think that is insulting. People will implement their political and civic position and I think that will be a correct assessment.

[Unidentified correspondent speaking in English with superimposed Russian translation] I work in Iceland as a newspaper publisher. Did you have any difficulties in coming to the decision to come to Reykjavik? This is a NATO country, and as you know, the government is in favor of having a nuclear-free zone proclaimed in the north of the country. I would like to know your attitude to these facts. Thank you.

[Gorbachev] I wanted to end this, but will avail myself of the fact that a representative of the Icelandic press is posing the question. I would like to say in reply to your question that we were the ones who proposed Iceland, and therefore we had no difficulty. I also want to thank the government and the people of Iceland for applying all their human, organizational, and material potential to doing their utmost to resolve the questions that needed to be resolved to hold this major meeting. We are grateful. We have felt comfortable here. We have had broad contacts. I have learned a particularly great deal of interesting information from Raisa Maksimovna, who had many interesting meetings in Iceland. The atmosphere was very friendly. There is very great interest in our country. We are very grateful to Iceland and the Icelandic Government for all they have done. We wish Iceland prosperity.

As for the latter part of your question, concerning the fact that the government of your country wishes to declare to be a nuclear-free zone, we welcome this. We welcome this, and regard this as a contribution.

Dear friends, thank you for your attention. I think we have spent the time usefully. I wish you all the best. Thank you. Goodbye. [applause]

None of you asked: General secretary, what is the role of the press at this important historic moment? Think about that! I'm asking you the question. [laughter] Goodbye.

PRAVDA Version

PM141237 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Oct 86 pp 1, 2

[Text] Reykjavik, October 13 TASS -- Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, gave a press conference in Reykjavik on October 12 for the journalists who covered the Soviet-American meeting.

Addressing the media, Mikhail Gorbachev said:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, comrades,

I welcome you all.

Our meeting with the U.S. President, Mr. Reagan, ended about an hour ago. It had lasted a little longer than we had planned. It was made necessary by business at hand. So I want to make my excuses to you for having failed to come for the press conference at the appointed time.

You already know that the meeting took place on the initiative of the Soviet leadership. But, naturally, there would have been no meeting if Mr. Reagan had not agreed to it. That is why, I would say, it was our joint decision to have that meeting.

Now it is over. It is sometimes said that face to face, you don't see the other's face. I've just emerged from the meeting which, especially in the closing stage, passed in pointed debates. I am still under the impression of those debates. Nevertheless, I will try now not only to share my impressions but also to sort out what took place. Yet it will be the first impressions, the early evaluations, the first analysis. The meeting as a whole is yet to be evaluated more substantially.

It was a major meeting and you yourselves will realize this when I recount its contents, the problems which were the subject of a very broad, very intensive and very interested discussion at it.

The atmosphere at the meeting was friendly. We had an opportunity to present our views freely and without restrictions. This enabled us to further our understanding on major problems of world politics, bilateral relations, primarily on those questions which are in the focus of world public attention, on problems of war and peace and ending the nuclear arms race, in short, on the entire complex of questions coming under that subject.

Before going over directly to the characterization of the meeting itself, the contents of the discussions, the proposals of the sides and its results, I want to explain to you why we came up with the initiative to hold the Reykjavik meeting. I am a regular reader of the world press and I saw in those days what a broad response the news of the meeting provoked.

A good deal was said in this context both about the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the U.S. President. The question was asked if they had not made haste, if there was any need for such a meeting, who made concessions to whom, who outplayed whom, and so on, and so forth. But you know, the cause that was the starting point for our proposal to the U.S. President to have a meeting without delay and his decision positively to respond to our invitation were very important.

I would now like to recall Geneva, when we met for the first time. It was a major dialogue and now, after quite some time, we have not revised our evaluation of the Geneva meeting. At that time, if you remember, we noted the special responsibility of the USSR and the United States of America for safeguarding peace and said jointly that nuclear war should never be fought and that there could be no winners in it. That was a statement of immense importance. We also said that neither side would seek military superiority.

It also was a very important statement.

Almost a year has passed since Geneva. The Soviet leadership remained loyal to the commitments it assumed there. Having returned from Geneva, we extended our moratorium: We had had it in effect till January 1 this year. Our test sites have been quiet for 14 months now -- is this not evidence of our commitment to the Geneva accords and our responsibility for the destinies of peace? Those were not easy decisions since tests in Nevada continued at that time and are going on now. On January 15 we made a major statement, in which a program for the elimination of nuclear weapons by the end of this century was formulated.

Last June the Warsaw Treaty countries put forward a major comprehensive program for large-scale reductions in the conventional armaments and armed forces in Europe. It also was a major step in view of the concerns aired by the West Europeans and the United States.

Drawing the lesson of the Chernobyl tragedy, we put forward the initiative on an emergency IAEA session in Vienna. It did take place and you know about its results -- they are very promising. Now we have an international mechanism making it possible to resolve many important questions of the safety of nuclear power engineering.

In other words, in the period under review -- and I do not think I am exaggerating by thus evaluating our policy because what I talk about is facts, not merely intentions -- we have been doing everything possible to contribute to the emergence of a new thinking in the nuclear age. it gives us pleasure to note that the shoots of this new thinking are sprouting, on the European field too. One piece of evidence was the success of the Stockholm meeting.

At this point, I'll probably conclude the list of the concrete actions that we have undertaken, guided by the letter and spirit of the Geneva agreements with President Reagan. The facts themsleves, I think, allow you to assess the seriousness of our attitude to the Geneva agreements.

Still, why the need for the Reykjavik meeting, what were the motives for our initiative?

As a matter of fact, the hopes for major changes in the world situation, which we all entertained, started to evaporate shortly after the Geneva meeting, and, in my opinion, not without grounds.

Much was said, perhaps, too much, during the Soviet-American talks, between 50 and 100 variants of proposals were put forward, as I told the president yesterday. This fact alone raises doubts as to the fruitfulness of the discussions under way there.

If there were one or two, even three variants, which would make it possible to narrow somehow the scope of discussions and concentrate the search on some major directions, it would be possible to expect that the search would bring about concrete agreements and proposals to the government...

But nothing of this kind is taking place in Geneva, although the discussion there is concerned with key issues of world politics. The negotiations have recently been running idle, so to say, and are practically at a standstill. The arms race has not been stopped, and it is becoming increasingly clear that developments are approaching a point at which a new spiral of the arms race becomes inevitable with unpredictable military and political consequences.

Our major initiatives, which I have already mentioned, have evoked a broad response from the world public, but they have not found due unuderstanding on the part of the American Administration.

The situation has been worsening, anxiety around the world has started to grow again. I think it is no exaggeration -- you yourselves are witnesses to that -- that the world is in turmoil.

The world is in turmoil, and it demands that the leaders of all countries, above all major powers, primarily the Soviet Union and the United States, display political will and determination capable of stopping the dangerous trends.

Thus, something has to be done to overcome such a course of developments. We reached the conclusion that a new impetus was necessary, a powerful impetus to turn the processes in the required direction.

Such impetuses could be made only by the leaders of the USSR and the U.S. That is why, in replying to President Reagan's July 25 letter, I decided to invite him to an immediate meeting. I wrote: the situation is such that we ought to put aside all affairs for a couple of days and hold the meeting without delay.

The letter was handed over to the President by Eduard Shevardnadze.

Now, this extremely important session has been completed. We believed that much would depebd on its outcome. And, naturally, we came to the meeting not empty handed.

What have we brought to Reykjavik? We have brought a whole package of major proposals which, once accepted, could really bring about within a brief period a breakthrough, I would say, in all directions of the struggle for limiting nuclear weapons and really avert the threat of nuclear war, making it possible to start moving towards a nuclear-free world.

I suggested that the President and I give right here in Reykjavik binding instructions to our foreign ministers and other corresponding departments to draft three agreements that we could sign with the President later during my visit to the United States.

The first -- on strategic arms -- stipulated a fifty per cent reduction, and no less, with an eye to fully eliminating these deadliest of weapons already by the turn of the century.

We proceeded from the premise that the world is waiting for really major steps, deep reductions rather than some cosmetic steps -- merely to calm down public opinion for a certain period. Really bold, responsible actions are now required in the interests of the entire world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union and the United States.

Naturally, both the Soviet and the American delegations, which would have been instructed to draft the agreement on strategic arms, should have balanced the reduction of their historical structure in a positive and honest way.

The point at issue is the very triad that was recognized way back when drafting SALT II. But when we started discussing this issue with the President, there reemerged in response everything that figures at the Geneva talks -- all levels and sublevels, in brief, much arithmetic, and everything intended to confuse the essence of the matter.

When we put forward the following specification: to reduce by half each component of the strategic offensive armaments: land-based strategic missiles, submarine-launched strategic missiles and strategic bombers.

The American delegation agreed to that. Thus, we reached agreement on a very big issue.

I also draw your attention to the fact that we made serious concessions here.

You must remember, to, that when we made our proposal on 50 percent cuts in Geneva, we counted medium-range missiles as strategic weapons because our territory is within their reach. Now we have dropped that demand, along with the question of forward-based systems.

Agreement was thus reached in Reykjavik on cuts in strategic weapons thanks to these major concessions.

Our next proposal concerned medium-range missiles. We proposed that instructions be given to draw up an accord on weapons of that type too, with a view to giving up all the options which had been discussed up to that time, temporary or interim, and going back to the earlier American proposal on the total elimination of American and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe. Moreover, unlike our Geneva proposals, we now left absolutely aside the nuclear potentials of France and Britain. Although, you understand, it was a very large concession on our part. Indeed, those two countries are allies of the USA, and they have large nuclear potentials, which continue to be built up and upgraded. And all their military activities are closely coordinated within NATO. We know this for certain. We nevertheless removed that obstacle to agreement.

There also was concern about Asia. We offered a compromise there as well: Let us sit down to negotiations immediately, clarify complaints and find a solution. We understood that the question of missiles with a range of less than 1,000 km was bound to arise. So we made a proposal on that question: a freeze on those missiles and talks on what to do with them.

These are the major measures we want to be taken. I think that the Americans had not expected this from us but they entered discussion and stated frankly that they were not happy about removing their missiles from Europe. They began anew to invite us to their intermediate option. We, however, insisted on the total riddance of Europe of both Soviet and American medium-range missiles.

In the course of the discussion on that question, we drew the U.S. President's attention to the fact that he was to all appearances renouncing his brainchild, the "zero option," which he was insistently offering some time ago. We now took it up.

The discussion, and very pointed discussion, continued into today. And we decided to take another step to meet the other side: We stated that if the American and Soviet missiles in Europe are eliminated, we agree to have 100 warheads left on our medium-range missiles and the Americans as many on theirs in U.S. territory.

Eventaully we agreed to have an accord on that question too, although again, as a matter of fact, it was thanks to a major concession on our part.

But then advance has to be started in some way. I have pointed this out on more than one occasion. There is a need for bold, innovative solutions! If we always turn to the past for advice and use what belongs to very different times, without regard for where we are today and where we will be tomorrow, and that there may be no tomorrow at all if we act in this way, there will be no dialogue. There must be some way of making a start. So we made this compromise although, I repeat, it was not easy for us. In short, we also agreed at the meeting with the U.S. President on the abolition and reduction of medium-range missiles.

In view of our readiness to make deep cuts in nuclear weapons, we formulated a question as follows: As soon as we are entering the concrete phase of the elimination of nuclear weapons, there must be absolute clarity about verification. Verification must now become tougher. The Soviet Union stands for triple verification, which should guarantee absolute confidence for each side that it would not be led into a trap. We reaffirmed our readiness for any form of verification. That question was removed, too, because of this stand of ours.

One more problem in view of our setting about the practical abolition of nuclear weapons is such: Each side should have a guarantee that during that time the other side will not be seeking military superiority. I think that it is a perfectly fair and legitimate requirement both politically and militarily.

Politically, if we begin reductions, we should take care that all existing brakes on the development of new types of weapons be not only preserved, but also strengthened.

Militarily: Indeed, care should be taken to preclude the following situation: Both sides have reduced the nuclear potentials and while the reduction process is underway, one of the sides secretly contemplates and captures the initiative and attains military superiority.

This is inadmissible. I apply this to the Soviet Union. We have all rights to lay similar demands on the American side.

In this connection, we raised the question in the following way: When we embark on the stage of a real, deep reduction and, after ten years, of the elimination of the nuclear potential of the Soviet Union and the United States, it is necessary that this period should not see the shaking of the mechanisms restraining the arms race, above all such as the ABM treaty. These mechanisms should be consolidated.

Our proposal was reduced to the following: The sides consolidate the ABM treaty of unlimited duration by assuming equal pledges that they shall not use the right to break out of the treaty within the next ten years.

Is this proposition correct and logical? It is logical.

Is it serious? It is serious.

Does it meet the interests of both sides? It does meet the interests of both sides.

Simultaneously, we suggested that all ABM requirements be strictly observed within these ten years, that the development and testing of space weapons be banned and only research and testing in laboratories be allowed.

What did we mean by this?

We are aware of the commitment of the American Administration and the President to SDI. Apparently, our consent to its continuation and to laboratory tests offers the President an opportunity to go through with research and eventually to get clear what SDI is, and what it is about, although it is already clear to many people, ourselves included.

It was at that point that a true battle of two approaches to world politics, including such questions as the termination of the arms race and a ban on nuclear weapons, began.

The American Administration and the President insisted to the end that America should have the right to test and study everything involved in SDI not only in laboratories but elsewhere, including the outer space.

But who will agree to this? A madman? But madmen, as a rule, are kept where they should be, where they are given medical care. Anyway, I do not see any in posts of leadership, especially at the helm of states.

We were on the brink of taking major, historic decisions, because up to then the point had always been merely arms reductions. We took decisions on ABM, SALT-I, SALT-II, etc.

Since the U.S. Administration, as we understand now, is confident of U.S. technological superiority and is hoping to achieve through SDI military superiority, it has gone even so far as burying the accords already achieved. We suggested that instructions were given for drawing up treaties with a view to their practical fulfillment. They could be signed during a meeting in Washington. But the American side torpedoed all this.

I told the President that we were missing an historic chance. Our positions had never been so close.

Bidding me goodbye, the President said that he was disappointed and that I had from the outset come unwilling to look for agreements and accords. Why do you display such firmness on SDI and the problem of testing, all that range of problems, because of one word? But I think that the matter is not words but substance. Herein lies the key to the understanding of what the U.S. Administration has on its mind. I think that it has on its mind what, as I now see, is on the mind of the American military-industrial complex. The administration is captive to the complex and the President is not free to take such a decision. We made breaks and held debates and I see that the President was not given support. That was why our meeting failed when we already were close to producing historic results.

That was the sort of dramatic situation that arose at that meeting, when, in spite of very substantial concessions on our part, we failed to reach accord.

...Although our dialogue with the USA was difficult, it continued after Geneva and I put to the President my view of what our meeting during my visit to the United States should be like. It is known to you.

It is not a condition. I think, it is understanding of our responsibility, both my own and the President's. It prompts precisely this approach to a future meeting in Washington. We need a productive meeting. It should really lead to tangible results, cardinal changes and steps, especially in such urgent questions as nuclear arms control, prevention of the arms race and elimination of nuclear weapons.

I told him so in my letters and repeated it in person during our meeting: You, Mr President, and I must not permit our meeting in Washington to fail. That is why I called upon you to have a meeting without delay. We have constructive contributions to make so as to reach agreement and come to a Washington meeting with serious proposals and serious decisions.

I cannot presume even for one moment that we have a meeting in Washington and that that meeting fails. What then, generally speaking, should people think in the Soviet Union, in the USA and all over the world? What sort of politicians are at the helm of those enormous states? They meet each other, exchange letters, already had their third meeting but they cannot agree on anything. This, I think, would be a downright scandalous outcome with unpredictable consequences. We just cannot permit this to happen. This would cause disappointment all over the world, not only in our countries.

This is in fact an outline of a Washington meeting as regards the way we should hold it and the results we should achieve. [paragraph continues]

That was what prompted us to propose a working meeting here, in Reykjavik, so as to sort out everything in a businesslike manner, to listen to each other attentively and to try to find points of contact and common approaches that would meet the interests of our two countries, the interests of our allies and those of the peoples of all countries.

Regrettably, the Americans came to this meeting empty-handed, with a set of mothballed proposals which are already choking the Geneva talks. We, as you see, submitted our proposals to overturn this situation to clear the way, to go over to a new stage and actually resolve the outstanding questions.

Now I have told you what happened.

What is to be done?

The United States remains as a reality, and the Soviet Union remains as a reality. A character in a novel of one of our Russian writers was going to close America -- but could not do so. We do not have such a syndrome. America is a reality, quite a reality. The Soviet Union, I think, also is a substantial reality. But the world, too, is a reality, and today one cannot gain any authority or, what is more important, resolve outstanding problems if one does not reckon with the realities of today's world.

At this meeting, we felt there was a shortage of new thinking. And there reemerged the ghost of pursuit for military superiority.

This summer I had a meeting with Mr Nixon, and he said to me: I have grounds to say, based on my vast political and life experience, that the search for that ghost of superiority has taken us too far. Now we do not know how to break out of the pileups formed by the mounds of nuclear weapons. All this is complicating, deteriorating the situation of the world.

I think, nevertheless, that agreements have become apparaent here. They have not only been endorsed. We put forward our proposals in a package. I think you understand why this was done. Nevertheless, the very path that we have covered with these agreements on major cuts in nuclear weapons gives us substantial experience and considerable gain.

I think that the U.S. President and we should reflect on the entire situation that has ultimately evolved here at the meeting, and make another try and step over the things that divide us.

We have agreed on many things already, traversed a long path. The President, probably, needs to consult Congress, political circles and the American public. Let America ponder on all that. We will be waiting, without withdrawing our proposals that we have made public. In fact, we have come to agreement on them. That was the first point.

Secondly, I think, that all realistically-minded forces in the world should act now. [paragraph continues]

We all, living in the socialist world, in the capitalist world and in the developing world, now have a unique chance: to really start, at last, work on ending the arms race, banning nuclear weapons, destroying them and diverting the nuclear threat from mankind.

In this connection, we submitted the following proposal to the U.S. President: Let us agree to start talks on banning nuclear explosions immediately after the conclusion of our meeting in Reykjavik.

At that, we proposed that this be a process in the course of which we could examine at some stage, perhaps, even on a top-priority basis, also the question of thresholds, and the nuclear blast yield, and the number of nuclear explosions per year, and the fate of the 1974 and 1976 treaties, and would move further towards the elaboration of a comprehensive treaty banning all nuclear explosions.

I'll tell you that we were close to finding a formula on this question as well. We told the American side: We do not demand that you introduce a moratorium. It is up to you. You report to your Congress, to the people on how you will continue nuclear explosions or whether you will join our moratorium during the talks that we will start. But let us sit down for full-scale talks to work out an agreement on the total and final prohibition of nuclear explosions.

In passing, we will also consider the questions that you mention: verification, thresholds, number of nuclear explosions, and the 1974-1976 treaties, all this can be examined.

The positions were drawing closer. But when there occurred a rupture on the question of ABM, when all the discussion was broken off and the search was suspended, we stopped our meeting.

I think that we and the Americans should reflect on all this, and world public opinion should reflect on the situation that has evolved in the world in respect to the principal issue of concern to peoples of all countries -- issues of war and peace, issues of the nuclear threat.

I think, and this is no exaggeration, that everything that we submitted to the President meets the interests of the American people and the peoples of all countries. If this does not seem to be true to someone, we are all eligible to say today: Listen to the demands of American people, Soviet people, the people of all countries.

I came here for the meeting and said that it was time for action. This is truly so.

Indeed, the time to act has come, and we should not waste it. We shall act. We shall not give up our course towards peace, towards the struggle against the arms race, for banning nuclear weapons, for eliminating nuclear weapons and for diverting the threat from all of our planet. I think that we shall not be alone in this struggle.

This is what I wanted to tell you now, right after the conclusion of the meeting. Perhaps, I could say more should I have more time to ponder everything that has happened. It seems to me, however, that I expressed myself clearly and definitely on all questions.

I do not mention now that we dwelt on many other issues. We discussed humanitarian issues and dealt with concrete problems in that sphere. Two groups of experts were at work. You probably already know about that. One of them was headed from our side by Marshal of the Soviet Union, Chief of the General Staff Akhromeyev, and from the American side by Paul Nitze. They worked practically through the night.

The group on humanitarian issues was headed from our side by Deputy Foreign Minister Bessmertnykh, and from the American side by Assistant Secretary of State Ridgway.

There was an interesting exchange of opinions there, too, and some understandings reached there could have been a component part of the final document. But since the main thing collapsed, the entire process ground to a standstill.

As you see, this was an interesting, important and promising meeting on the whole. But it has ended this way for the time being.

But let us not give way to despair. I think that this meeting has brought us to a very important stage of understanding where we are. It has shown that accords are possible. I am sure of this.

Thank you.

Do you still have questions even after such a detailed speech delivered by me? Well, come up with them. Let us sit until the early hours.

Question (Czechoslovak television): Mikhail Sergeyevhch, you said that a historic change has been lost here, in Reykjavik. When, do you thnk, a new change will emerge?

Reply: You know I should like to give an optimistic answer to this. Because much was done on the eve of the meeting and at the meeting. If we again think over everything and display realism and responsibility both in the United States, in the White House and in our Soviet leadership, then the chance will not be lost to resolve these questions.

Question (Japanese NHK TV company): Does it mean that the dialogue with the USA, with the Reagan administration is still going on? Or you think that possibilities are very small for a productive dialogue with Reagan?

Reply: I think that at present the need for the dialogue has become even greater, no matter how difficult it would be.

Question (newspaper PRAVDA): Mikhail Sergeyevich, what do you think, why did the U.S. Administration decide to wreck the negotiations, taking such an irresponsible decision and ignoring world public opinion?

Reply: I think that America has yet to make up its mind. I think it has not done this yet. This, as we felt, affected the President's stand.

Question (Australian Radio Broadcasting Corporation): You said that President Reagan is a captive of the military industrial complex. Does it mean that the next 2 years will be sterile? Are you hopeful that the next U.S. president will not be a captive of this complex?

Reply: Irrespective of what the military-industrial complex is at present and irrespective of what place it holds in present-day America, let us not overestimate its possibilities. The final say is with the people of any country, including the American people.

Question (Icelandic radio and television): After the negative result of the summit, will the Soviet Union counter the American SDI program with something else and will it not launch its space arms programme full blast?'
Reply: I think that you have understood the essence of the Soviet position. If now we have approached a stage at which we start a drastic cut in nuclear weapons, both strategic and medium-range missiles (we have already approached understanding with the Americans to do this in the next decade), we have the right to demand that we should be guaranteed in this period that nothing surprising and unforeseen will take place. This also includes such a sphere as space and deployment of a space-based ABM system.

I told the President (maybe I will slightly open the curtain over our exchange of opinions) that the SDI does not bother us militarily. In my opinion, nobody in America believes that such a system can be created. Moeover, if America eventually decides to do this, our reply will not be symmetrical. True, I told him: Mr. President, you know that I have already been turned into your ally in the SDI issue. He was surprised by this. It turns out, I tell him, that since I so sharply criticize the SDI, this offers you a convincing argument that the SDI is needed. You just say: If Gorbachev is against it, this means that it is a good thing. You win applause and financing. True, cynics and sceptics have appeared who say: What if this is Gorbachev's crafty design -- to stay out of the SDI and to ruin America. So you figure this out yourself. But we are not scared by the SDI in any case.

I say this with confidence, since it is irresponsible to bluff in such matters. There will be reply to the SDI. An asymmetrical one, but it will be. We shall not sacrifice much at that.

But what is its danger? For one thing, a political danger. A situation is created right away, which brings uncertainty and fans up mistrust for each other and suspicion. Then the reduction of nuclear weapons will be put aside. In short, quite another situation is needed for us to take up thoroughly the question of reducing nuclear weapons. Second, there is a military aspect after all. The SDI can lead to new types of weapons. We also can say this with competence. It can lead to an entriely new stage of the arms race which is unpredictable for its serious consequences.

It turns out that, on the one hand, we agree to start reduction of nuclear weapons -- at present the most dangerous and dreadful, and, on the other -- we should bless research, and even conduct it in space, on location, so as to create the latest weapons. This does not agree with normal logic.

Question (THE WASHINGTON POST): You have just held another meeting with President Reagan after 2 days of sessions. What is your impression of the President as a political figure? Do you believe that he shares your sense of responsibility for the destinies of the world?

Answer: My impression is that Mr Reagan and I can continue the dialogue and engage in the quest for ways to resolve major pressing problems, including those I spoke about.

Question (Danish television): Do the unsatisfactory results of the meeting mean that no progress will be achieved on the banning of nuclear tests and other problems which were discussed yesterday and today? Is this problem -- the banning of nuclear tests -- linked with other problems discussed at the sessions?

Answer: I have answered this question already. We believe that our contacts with Americans and with the President, much less international relations, have not been broken off as a result of the latest developments. The quest is going on, and it will be further continued. In my opinion, there is even more reason for the developments that took place here, in Iceland, to become a powerful impetus that would make us all realize that we should join the common struggle for the normalization of the international situation, for the quest for ways out of impasse situations, including those which were discussed here, in Reykjavik. In fact, another impasse situation emerged here as well. However, I am an optimist.

Questions (GDR television): You said that the meeting had brought no results. Does it mean that it was useless? What do you think: Has peace become more reliable after the Reykjavik meetings?

Answer: I think, you have considered your question thoroughly. What I like about our German friends is the accuracy of expressions, including the expression of thoughts. In my opinion, despite the fact that we concluded our meeting without reaching agreement on the problems to which we seemed to have found approaches, what happened in Reykjavik is sad [pechalnyy] and dissappointing. However, the meeting can hardly be described as fruitless.

On the contrary, it is a new stage in a complicated and difficult dialogue in search of solutions. After all we are searching for far from easy solutions to difficult issues. This is why we do not spread panic throughout the world. But at the same time, we should state that the world should know all that is going on and should not feel like an onlooker. The time has come for vigorous actions by all forces.

Question (American TV company ABC): Mr. General Secretary, I don't understand why, when you had an opportunity to achieve with President Reagan agreement on cuts in nuclear weapons, the Soviet side did not agree to SDI research. You yourself said in Geneva that you were ready to pay a high price for nuclear arms cuts. Now, when you had such an opportunity, you missed it.

Answer: Your question contains an element of criticism, so I will answer it in some detail.

First, the U.S. President came to Reykjavik with empty hands and empty pockets. The American delegation, I would say brought us trash from the Geneva talks. It was only thanks to the far-reaching proposals of the Soviet side that we were about to reach most major agreements (they were not formalized, mind you) on cuts in strategic offensive weapons and on medium-range missiles. [paragraph continues]

Naturally, we hoped in that situation -- and I think it is perfectly clear to a politician, a military man and any normal person in general -- that if we are to sign such agreements on major cuts in nuclear weapons, we should take care to ensure that nothing could thwart that difficult process, towards which we had been moving for decades. Then we raised the question that we stood for strengthening the ABM treaty. The American side is constantly burrowing under the ABM treaty.

It has already called in question SALT II and would now like to stage a funeral of the ABM treaty in Reykjavik, moreover, with the participation of the Soviet Union and Gorbachev. That will not do. The world as a whole would not understand us, it is my conviction.

All of you who are sitting here, all of you are convinced that if we begin to attack the ABM treaty in addition to everything else, the last mechanism which has contributed so much to constraining, in spite of everything, the process of the arms race, we are worthless politicians. But it is not enough to preserve its terms at a time when deep cuts in nuclear weapons are initiated. We think that the treaty must be strengthened. We proposed a mechanism of strengthening it -- not to use the right to pull out of the ABM treaty during the ten years in which we will totally reduce and destroy the nuclear potentials in our countries.

At the same time, to ensure that neither the Soviet Union seeks to overtake America in space research and achieve military superiority nor America seeks to overtake the Soviet Union, we said that we agreed to laboratory research and testing but opposed to the emergence with that research and testing of components of space-based ABM defenses into outer space. This is our demand. Our demand in that case also was constructive and reckoning with America's stand. If she agreed, she would get an opportunity to resolve her problems within the framework of continued laboratory research but without attempts to develop space ABM defenses. I think there is iron logic here, as the children say, and sometimes we should learn even from children.

Now let ladies have a chance.

Question (THE GUARDIAN): Is the Soviet Union planning any new initiatives for Western Europe after what came to pass in Reykjavik?

Answer: I think Western Europe is hearing what I am saying and if she thinks over and closely studies our proposals, she will find them meeting her interests. We understand that we cannot be indifferent to the interests of Western Europe, in which the shoots of new thinking are taking root and in which responsibility is growing for the preservation and strengthening of our European home.

Question (NEWSWEEK magazine): What are your plans for a visit to Washington? You said that an agreement or two should be achieved before such a visit. Can such agreements be achieved before you come on a visit to Washington?

Answer: I think that in spite of the dramatic events of today, we are not farther from Washington but closer to it, if the President and the U.S. Administration listen to my proposal to continue studying everything we discussed here in Reykjavik and keep counsel with those circles they think necessary to consult. I do not think everything is lost. There are opportunities to rely on what we had here in Reykjavik to reach agreements which will make a meeting in Washington real and possible and it could produce results.

Question (American TV Company CNN): Mr. Gorbachev, you said in your speech that President Reagan should think over the situation and keep counsel with Congress and the American people. Do you think that American public opinion will back the Soviet approach?

Answer: We will wait and see.

Question (RUDE PRAVO): I have a question for you as a politician and a lawyer. What do you think of human rights priorities in the nuclear-missile age and what role the human factor can play in deciding questions of war and peace?

Answer: You are a philosopher. I myself once studied philosophy and have now again turned to it. I think that when we discuss human rights, we should remember that the question of safeguarding peace and averting the nuclear threat from man today is the main priority. If there is peace, there will be life -- and we will sort out problems in one way or another. There are more and more educated people in the world. I think the people will sort out everything. That is why when we discuss human rights, I will attach priority to man's right to live. This is the first point.

The second is the human factor. I believe that in the nuclear age (and I consider it a manifestation of new thinking) the threat of nuclear war gives a new dimension to the role of the human factor in the struggle for peace, for the prevention of war. Because today a war will affect everyone regardless of where it breaks out. It is only ill-wishers who see the hand of Moscow behind all the anti-war movements, all those who work for peace. Women, children, and men of all ages are coming to the fore today, linking hands and demanding a stop to the dangerous tendency under which the world is advancing towards the threat of nuclear war. I think that the role of the human factor is growing immensely in this situation.

Question (IZVESTIYA): The White House has talked a good deal and often that the main danger to America is posed by the Soviet ICBM's. But we proposed in Reykjavik that this main danger to America be eliminated over 10 years. What do you think of the reasons why the other side proved not ready to strike down this main danger and avert it from its country?

Answer: You are quite right to pose this question. It was used by the American side over the years to claim that the Soviet Union was not serious about disarmament and ending the arms race, that is disregarded America's concern, etc.

As you see, we proposed radical reductions, and put the question very pointedly, moveover. There is the trial of strategic weapons recognized both by us and by the Americans. We suggested that all that triad of the strategic armed forces be cut by 50 percent over the first five years. It was a major step.

At the same time we told the Americans that we were concerned, too. The United States has 70 percent of its strategic forces deployed on submarines. It is 656 independently targetable multiple warheads. The submarines are known to be circling the Soviet Union in the seas and oceans around it. Whence will they strike? It is worse than heavy ground-launched missiles.

In short, when they do not want to come to grips with questions, they look for problems and raise artificial obstacles. [paragraph continues]

But in our case those obstacles were removed. This is the important thing. We indeed took a very important step by dropping reservations on medium-range missiles, which have strategic importance to America. We also excluded from the count forward-based systems in our approach to strategic missiles. All this shows our goodwill. Yet the Americans did not meet us halfway.

The Americans think that they will achieve military superiority over us through outer space and realize the idea of one of their presidents, who said: He who will dominate outer space will dominate earth. This shows that what we have to deal with is imperial ambitions.

But the world today is not what it once was. It does not want to and will not be the happy hunting grounds of either the United States of America or the Soviet Union. Every country has the right to a choice, to its own ideology, to its own values. If we do not recognize this, there are no international relations. What there is is chaos and the law of the fist. We will never agree to it.

America must be very nostaligic about olden times, when she was strong and militarily superior to us, as we all had emerged from the war economically weakened.

There must be nostalgia in America. Yet we should wish our American partners to come to grips with today's realities. They ought to do so too. Otherwise, if the Americans do not start thinking in today's terms and proceeding from today's realities, we will not make progress in our search for correct solutions.

Question (Bulgarian television): I take it that the Geneva talks will not be stopped, and the Soviet leadership is going to give instructions to the Soviet delegation to quest for ways to resolve the problems which have not been resolved so far.

Answer: You are right.

Question: Do you think that after the Reykjavik meeting similar instructions will be given to the American delegation?

Answer: I hope it will be so.

Question (CTK news agency): In what way, do you think, will the outcome of the Reykjavik meeting influence the all-European process?

Answer: In my opinion both the politicians and people of Europe will measure up to the situation as well in this very important moment. Time requires actions, not just eloquent statements which are not followed by anything concrete. The world is tired, it is fed up with empty talk, it needs real progress in the sphere of disarmament and the elimination of nuclear weapons. I believe that this trend will be getting more prominent. I am pinning special hope on the wisdom and sense of responsibility of the politicians and people of Europe.

Question (American NBC television company): As I understand, you are directly calling on other members of the world community to act as a kind of a lobby in order to influence the United States and make it change its mind?

Answer: We know how developed lobbyism is in your country, how the political process goes in America. Perhaps, that is why it was difficult for the President to make a decision at this meeting.

But when the matter at hand is related to consolidating peace and undertaking real steps to this end, when concerted efforts are needed -- this concerns all, not only the United States and the Soviet Union -- then, I think, one should speak not about lobbyism, but about the sense of responsibility, the common sense of people, about the appreciation of today's peace and the need to protect it.

It is, therefore, insulting to accuse people of movements campaigning for peace of being lobbyists for the Soviet Union. The point at issue is that people uphold their political and civic stance.

Question (Icelandic newspaper MORGUNBLADID): I publish a newspaper in Iceland. Was it hard for you to decide on coming to Reykjavik? For Iceland is a NATO member. At the same time, as is known, our government proposed proclaiming the north a nuclear-free zone, and I would like to know your attitude to this.

Answer: I would like to end the press conference with this subject and will use with pleasure the question put by a representative of the Icelandic press. I want to recall that it was the USSR which suggested Iceland as a possible venue for the meeting. That is why we had no difficulties whatsoever on this account.

I want to thank the Government of Iceland, the people of Iceland for using all their potential -- human, organizational and material -- for resolving all questions of arranging the meeting.

We are grateful for that, and we felt at ease here. I received much interesting information from Raisa Maximovna who had had many meetings in Iceland. They were all very interesting. We are pleased with the friendly atmosphere and the great interest in our country. We thank Iceland, the Icelandic Government for what they have done. We wish prosperity to your people.

As to the latter part of your question concerning the intention of your country's government to proclaim the north a nuclear-free zone -- we welcome this.

Dear friends, thank you for your attention. I think that we have spent the time usefully. I wish you all the best. Good-bye.

GORBACHEV DEPARTURE, ARRIVAL IN MOSCOW

Farewell in Reykjavik

LD131245 Moscow TASS in English 1222 GMT 13 Oct 86

[Text] Reykjavik October 13 TASS -- General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev left Reykjavik today.

National flags of the USSR and Iceland were hoisted at the airport in honour of the distinguished guest.

Mikhail Gorbachev was seen off at the ramp by Prime Minister of Iceland Steingrimur Hermannsson and Acting Foreign Minister Torstein Paulsson. The USSR's Ambassador in Iceland Yevgeniy Kosarev, the USSR's ambassador in the United States Yuriy Dubinin, other Icelandic and Soviet officials were among the seeing off party.

The officials, who participated in the Soviet-American summit meeting also left Reykjavik. They are member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Foreign Minister of the USSR Eduard Shevardnadze, Secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee Anatoliy Dobrynin and Aleksandr Yakovlev, Assistant General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Anatoliy Chernyayev, first Deputy Defense Minister of the USSR Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhromeyev.

Moscow Airport Welcome

LD131736 Moscow TASS in English 1729 GMT 13 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow October 13 TASS -- The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev returned here today from Reykjavik where he had a meeting with the President of the United States Ronald Reagan.

Secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee Anatoliy Dobrynin and Aleksandr Yakovlev, Assistant to the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Anatoliy Chernyayev and First Deputy Minister of Defense of the USSR Sergey Akhromeyev returned together with Mikhail Gorbachev.

At the airport Mikhail Gorbachev was welcomed by members of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee Geydar Aliyev, Andrey Gromyko, Lev Zaykov, Yegor Ligachev, Mikhail Solomentsev, Viktor Chebrikov, Alternate Members of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee Vladimir Dolgikh, Boris Yeltsin, Nikolay Talyzin, Secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Zimyanin, Vadim Medvedev, Georgiy Razumovskiy, Chairman of the Central Auditing Commission of the CPSU Ivan Kapitonov and other comrades.

The welcoming party included the charge d'affaires ad interim of the United States in the USSR Richard Coombs and of Iceland in the USSR Benedict Jonsson.

Television Shots of Return

LD132032 [Editorial Report] Moscow television service in Russian at 1800 GMT on 13 October carries a 1-minute report on the return of Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev to Moscow. Gorgachev's IL-62 aircraft is seen taxiing in and members of the politburo emerge from the arrival hall. Gorbachev descends the aircraft steps and shakes hands first with Gromyko, while Ligachev, Chebrikov, and Zaykov look on. Aliyev is visible in the background. Gorbachev then walks behind a group of people which includes Raisa Gorbachev and Dobrynin, to shake hands with Aliyev, while Solomentsev, then moves left to shake hands with Kapitonov, while Dolgikh, Zimyanin, and Talyzin look on. Gorbachev and Raisa are then seen walking away from the aircraft in the company of Gromyko, Solomentsev, Aliyev, Zimyanin, Dolgikh, and Yeltsin. The entire group then enters the arrival hall.

REYKJAVIK OUTCOME LAMENTED, BLAMED ON SDI

PM140831 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Oct 86 First Edition p 4

[Own correspondent V. Gan dispatch under general heading "The Echo of Reykjavik: Seeing the Historical Perspective"]

[Text] Washington, 13 Oct -- All leading U.S. television companies are now turning time and again to events of the last 2 days in an attempt to understand what happened, why it was that the reported movement [prodvizheniye] of the sides toward major agreements turned into bitter failure. At the end of the first day's exchange of opinions NBC-TV reported: "U.S. delegation members consider that M.S. Gorbachev is displaying a readiness for cooperation and wants to lead Soviet-U.S. relations along a more stable and more predictable course. The main stress is on arms control, and everyone appraised this as a good omen in terms of the possibility of reaching agreement."

The second day of discussions also began with a fairly optimistic appraisal of the prospects for accord. Every half-hour, interrupting their programs, the television companies "measured the pulse," offered their analysis, made forecasts. But the announcement that the meeting had failed in literally the last few hours caught them unawares. "Following long talks and what appeared to be the likelihood of progress at midday, now there is not even agreement to meet again," NBC's anchorman reported from Reykjavik.

Analyzing the events, all the mass news media without exception declare that the reason for the collapse of the talks is rooted in Washington's stubborn unwillingness to abandon the "star wars" program which, according to UPI, "cut the ground from under the final agreement," Reporting and citing in detail M.S. Gorbachev's statement at the press conference in Iceland's capital, the U.S. press, radio, and television admit the validity of the Soviet arguments and note the desire displayed by the Soviet Union for specific steps in the arms control sphere. It was no accident that the ABC correspondents covering the Reykjavik meeting voiced the opinion that "the Soviet Union emerged as the moral victor from the meeting." One of them stated that the tenor of the talks unambiguously showed that the sides could have achieved major reductions of strategic weapons and medium-range missiles and consolidation of the ABM Treaty if only President Reagan had made concessions on SDI. "For many people, including the U.S. European allies, responsibility for the meeting's failure lies with Reagan," a special news report by the television company said. THE WASHINGTON POST essentially admits that the U.S. Administration has on its mind what the U.S. military-industrial complex has on its mind. The newspaper writes: "Being a flourishing program of research and development, SDI enjoys powerful support from the creators of weapons."

Observers indicate that Reyjkavik has now raised a question about the administration's entire approach toward arms control. "The President declared that arms upgrading is necessary before disarmament. Congress has given him everything he requested in terms of appropriations for new weapon systems, including SDI. But his theory failed to work here," ABC noted.

As if admiting the fairness of this conclusion, the President and his entourage launched a feverish attempt to justify the U.S. obstructionism. But the statements made by Reagan, Shultz, and White House Chief of Staff Regan were so contrary to well-known facts that they hardly made any great impression on anyone. Republican Senator R. Lugar was alone among the first to react to the news from Reykjavik in supporting the U.S. delegation's actions, finding nothing better than to praise the President for what he called avoding the "Soviet trap." [paragraph continues]

"A sad day for mankind," was how Senator C. Pell described the collapse of the talks, noting: "Essentially we rejected a bird in the hand -- the reduction of strategic arms, for the sake of two in the sky -- SDI." "I deeply regret the inability to reach the accord which was only just round the corner," he said. President Reagan "made a mistake," Senator C. Mathias stated. "It is obvious that the administration is incapable of ensuring peace throughout the world," Representative T. Coelho declared. Senator S. Nunn predicted that the "star wars" program will be subject to greater criticism than ever before on Capitol Hill. "Many legislators share the USSR's arguments on SDI," ABC-TV added.

The same point was made in a conversation with your correspondent by Rear Admiral G. Larocque, retired, director of the prestigious Center for Defense Information. "I think," he said, "that M.S. Gorbachev's arguments are shared by many Americans. It was SDI that wrecked the talks, and this is tragic. Reagan preferred to reply more on defense against missiles than on reducing or even eliminating missiles. This is the essence of the problem. I am convinced that we must move in the direction of missile reductions. We are missing a real chance."

Commentaries in the U.S. mass news media are now dominated mainly by question marks. No one dares predict the future of Soviet-U.S. relations where, in THE WASHINGTON POST's opinion, " a period of uncertainty and tension lies ahead." But it seems that many Americans agree with the words of Senator Pell, who declared: "Let us hope that a reconsideration will convince the President to move toward the achievement of the historic accord which we almost achieved."

REAGAN TRIES 'TO DECLINE' RESPONSIBILITY

LD140713 Moscow World Service in English 0700 GMT 14 Oct 86

[Text] Speaking on national television, President Reagan tried to decline all responsibility for the wrecking of agreements on the limitation of nuclear arms at the Soviet-American summit meeting in Reykjavik. The head of the American Administration explained his refusal to make a compromise on the question of the Strategic Defense Initiative by saying that the program was allegedly the key to a nuclear-free world.

Meanwhile, the President's stubborn striving to continue the realization of the "star wars" program blocked the working out of history making agreements in the field of disarmament. According to news analysts, by demonstrating his adherence to the SDI once again, the President has put to doubt the sincerity of his statements about being interested in arms control

MOSCOW-SAN FRANCISCO TELEBRIDGE CARRIED

LD110248 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1545 GMT on 9 October carries a 60-minute telebridge linking television studios in Moscow and San Francisco, which includes comments from several cities in both the United States and the Soviet Union. Moderating the telebridge from Moscow is Academician Yevgeniy Velikhov, who is identified by screen caption. In San Francisco, Dr T. Malone makes introductory remarks.

The debate begins with a general discussion about the economic, environmental, and safety aspects of various forms of energy production and the responsibility borne by scientists in that field. Accidents at Chernobyl and Three Mile Island are given as examples of problems that can arise during the interaction of man and machine. Velikhov further points out that a nuclear weapon exchange would entail tremendous destruction of life and environment.

U.S. professor Robert Gale, who tended radiation victims in Chernobyl, discusses the effects of radiation on people's health, including radiation sickness and cancer.

In Moscow Yu. Izrael, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, turns to the topic of alternative energy sources, touching on solar, wind, and geothermal energy, but affirming that nuclear energy is the only serious alternative to burning fossil fuels.

Velikhov closes the proceedings by noting the enormous potential that exists to make the world a safer and happier place and hopes that this potential will be realized. Malone says that the telebridge was encouraging, revealing the coincidence of interests in avoiding possible casues of conflicts. Velikhov then proposes a joint project to build a thermonuclear reactor including U.S., Japanese, European, and USSR participation.

U.S. AUTHORITIES ORDER PLUTONIUM PLANT CLOSINGS

LD120827 Moscow TASS in English 0748 GMT 12 Oct 86

[Text] Paris October 12 TASS -- U.S. Authorities have ordered two major plants, which produced the larger part of plutonium for U.S. nuclear weapons, closed down immediately and indefinitely, AGENCE FRANCE PRESSE reported. It said the authorities had to take the difficult decisions after an extremely dangerous emergency at one of those plants in Washington State on September 29. Inadequate controlling devices and staff carelessness in making a plutonium-based chemical mixture there very nearly resulted in a runaway nuclear chain reaction which could have led to a violent radioactive gas discharge into the air. In the worst case, the reaction could have been crowned by a nuclear explosion with unpredictable consequences.

A later equipment check-up at the other plant, which is also owned by the government and partially by Rockwell Hamford operation, revealed that a terrible disaster could happen also there.

Reporting these facts, FRANCE PRESS quoted "officials" who had not found it necessary to tell the nation about what had happened.

WEINBERGER 'ATTACKS' ON SOVIET POLICY CITED

OW101915 Moscow in Mandarin to China 0200 GMT 10 Oct 86

[Text] U.S. Secretary of Defense Weinberger, now visiting China, met with Chinese leaders Zhao Ziyang and Deng Xiaoping on Thursday. He delivered a letter from President Reagan to Deng Xiaoping.

At a press conference held in Beijing, Weinberger said that it had been agreed during his visit that three American warships would make a port call at Qingdao in China from 5 to 11 November. On the same day, he delivered a speech at the Chinese Military Academy, truculently attacking the Soviet peace policy in an effort to acquit the United States of its slander that the Soviet Union is posing a threat in Asia.

Troop Remarks Condemned

OW120530 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to China 0400 GMT 10 Oct 86

[Glebov commentary]

[Excerpts] U.S. Secretary of Defense Weinberger, who is visiting the People's Republic of China, asserted that the Soviet Union is expanding its military forces in Afghanistan. Station Observer Glebov has the following comments in this connection:

The Soviet Defense Ministry has announced that starting 15 October six regiments of Soviet troops, which are a part of the limited Soviet forces temporarily stationed in Afghanistan at the request of the Afghan Government, will be withdrawn from that country, and the withdrawal will be completed by the end of this month. Weinberger made the remarks noted above immediately after the Soviet announcement. [passage omitted]

In the past few days newspapers and television and radio programs in the world have repeatedly expressed the view that the Soviet Union has taken a correct step and that the withdrawal of six regiments of Soviet troops from Afghanistan is undoubtedly conducive to creating a favorable atmosphere for solving the Afghan issue. Is Mr Weinberger uneasy about this view? He apparently attempted to use an irresponsible fabrication to slander the Soviet Union's policy. [passage omitted]

In recent years we have repeatedly seen that some people took advantage of the Afghan issue to stir up anti-Soviet fanaticism, and this was in turn used by the bellicose group in the United States in order to further strengthen arms competition. Mr Weinberger has played a major role in this respect. Naturally, the U.S. secretary of defense and his company do not wish to lose the opportunity to use the so-called Afghan issue to serve the interests of the monopolized military industries in the United States. [passage omitted]

Mr Weinberger knows all those things, so he tries every means to worsen the situation in order to obstruct the peaceful settlement of all problems. Accordingly, he asserted that the Soviet Union has increased its troops in Afghanistan, in disregard of facts.

A Soviet Defense Ministry spokesman pointed out that U.S. Secretary of Defense Weinberger's assertion that the Soviet Union recently sent additional troops to Afghanistan was a sheer fabrication.

The spokesman told the press that the Soviet Union is surprised that a high ranking official of the United States told such a lie. As reported earlier, the Soviet Union will withdraw six regiments of its limited troops stationed in Afghanistan on temporary basis at the request of the Afghan Government starting 15 October, and the withdrawal will be completed by the end of this month.

Holds Talks, Departs

LD111700 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 11 Oct 86

[Text] The visit by U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger to China ended today. During the course of talks held with Deng Xiaoping, chairman of the PRC Central Military Council; Zhao Ziyang, premier of the State Council; and Zhang Aiping, minister of defense; problems of the development of ties between the military departments of the two countries were discussed, in particular questions of supplies to China of certain U.S. weapons systems and the transfer of military technology.

Weinberger arrived in Delhi on an official visit today.

ROGACHEV, WU ZUEQIAN DISCUSS REYKJAVIK SUMMIT

PM121533 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Oct 86 First Edition p 4

[Text] Beijing, 11 Oct -- Igor Rogachev, special representative of the Soviet Government and deputy minister of foreign affairs, who is in Beijing in connection with the ninth round of Soviet-Chinese political consultations, has been received by Wu Xueqian, member of the CPC Central Committee Politburo, member of the PRC State Council and minister of foreign affairs.

In the course of the conversation, issues relating to Soviet-Chinese relations were discussed, as well as certain international and regional problems.

The Soviet side stressed the importance of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Reykjavik. We welcome the meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan, stated Wu Xueqian, and hope that both sides with reach agreement on a radical reduction of nuclear arms, which would help ease tension and facilitate peace throughout the world.

The Soviet representative expressed certain practical considerations relating to ways of implementing the ideas and proposals on further developing relations between the USSR and the PRC, set out in Mikhail Gorbachev's speech in Vladivostok on 28 July.

Oleg Troyanovskiy, USSR ambassador to the PRC, took part in the conversation.

MOSCOW REPORTS INCREASED TRADE WITH CHINA

OW110625 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1200 GMT 9 Oct 86

[Text] Two-way trade between the Soviet Union and China during the first half of this year grew 25 percent over the same period last year. According to preliminary estimates by the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Trade, the growth will increase. A Soviet industrial exhibition scheduled to be held in China in December will provide the opportunity for more trade, when major contracts on barter trade will be signed.

DPRK'S KIM IL-SONG TO VISIT IN OCTOBER

LD140926 Moscow TASS in English 0916 GMT 14 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow October 14 TASS -- Kim Il-Song, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea and president of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, will pay a visit of friendship to the USSR at the invitation of the Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in the third decade of October. [sentence as received]

TASS REPORTS U.S. PLANE CRASHES IN SOUTH KOREA

LD140008 Moscow TASS in English 0003 GMT 14 Oct 86

["U.S. Spy Plane Crashes" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Tokyo October 14 TASS -- A U.S. RF-4S reconnaissance plane crashed in landing on the Osan military base in South Korea. The aircraft plummeted to earth in the airfield and caught fire killing both pilots. The aircraft was assigned to the U.S. Air Force Kadena base in Okinawa, from where planes take off for their espionage missions.

MARCHUK RECEIVES JAPANESE S & T DELEGATION

LD111847 Moscow TASS in English 1838 GMT 11 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow October 11 TASS -- Today Guriy Marchuk, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, chairman of the State Committee for Science and Technology, received a Japanese delegation led by Mr Yoshiyama, chairman of the board of directors of Hitachi Company, and had a conversation with them.

The delegation had arrived here to attend the eighth session of the Soviet- Japanese subcommittee on scientific and technical cooperation.

Matters aimed at widening cooperation between Soviet industrial organisations and Japanese firms in the field of production, scientific and technical activities were discussed.

PRAVDA REPORTS MPRP DELEGATION'S VISIT

PM130919 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Oct 86 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Interparty Ties"]

[Text] In accordance with the plan for interparty ties between the CPSU and the MPRP, a delegation of MPRP officials headed by (Ya. Losolsuren), member of the MPRP Central Committee and head of a MPRP Central Committee section, visited the Soviet Union on 28 September-4 October.

The Mongolian comrades acquainted themselves with the experience of the work of CPSU party organizations and held meetings and talks at CPSU Central Committee sections, the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, and a number of party committees and visited industrial and agricultural enterprises.

DRA'S NAJIBULLAH DISCUSSES PARTIAL WITHDRAWAL

LD132216 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 13 Oct 86

[Interview granted by General Secretary of the PDPA Central Committee Najibullah to Soviet radio and television correspondents in Kabul -- recorded; date not given]

[Text] [Correspondent] Comrade Najibullah, what, in your opinion, is the significance of the Soviet concept of comprehensive security for the settlement of regional conflicts, including the political situation in Afghanistan?

[Najibullah in Dari, fading to Russian translation] We are studying with great interest the speech of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, his statements which contain global peace initiatives. In these documents, the comprehensive plan for reorganization of international relations is examined carefully; there are issues that are particularly close to the people of revolutionary Afghanistan. They concern ways to ensure security in Asia and in the Pacific. We understand the concept of comprehensive security as respecting sovereignty, independence; as having a respectful attitude toward legal governments; as respecting obligations and agreements. It is not hard to see that regional conflicts are born in the same rooms where the plans for great star wars are born. The neoglobalism that wants to reconstruct the world according to its drawings is becoming increasingly dangerous. Here the comprehensive system of security with which the measures for the liquidation of regional conflicts are organically linked is of decisive importance. Having said all this, I think that only by this peaceful way can questions that have piled up around Afghanistan be resolved.

[Correspondent] Comrade Najib, how does the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan see the forthcoming return home of a part of the Soviet military contingent?

[Najibullah] Our people received with deep understanding the statement of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in Vladivostok about the return home of six regiments. I would like to stress that an agreement has been reached in this respect between the governments of our countries. This decision has been taken jointly. The Central Committee has focused all efforts of the party on organizing a call-up, guarding the borders with Pakistan and Iran, strengthening the armed forces of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. You ask what were the feelings of our people. The following words are perhaps most precise: gratitude and confidence. You people have extended a helping hand in the most difficult time, and forever more we shall be grateful to soldiers-internationalists for saving our people, our territorial integrity, our sovereignty. The withdrawal of troops is also proof that the revolutionary people and armed forces are increasingly able to defend the achievements of the revolution. Soviet friends teach us to feel confident, and confidence is the way towards victory.

Keshtmand Interview

LD101859 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 10 Oct 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The process of gradual stabilization in the DRA is gathering force.

The country today is the topic of an interview with Soltan Ali Keshtmand, chairman of the DRA Council of Ministers. Our special correspondent Farid Seyful-Mulyukov talks to him.

[Begin recording] [Seyful-Mulyukov] Comrade Keshtmand, your country and your people are waging a difficult struggle on two fronts. They are defending the freedom and independence of the motherland, and they are accomplishing the complicated tasks of socio-economic construction. Please tell us what precisely are the tasks in that field?

[Keshtmand, speaking in vernacular, fading to Russian translation] The national Democratic Revolution in Afghanistan is a critical and lengthy process. First and foremost, the armed aggression of imperialism and reaction against our country must be ended. Opposition to the counterrevolution forces is also linked with the radical transformation in all spheres of life. Our party has decided to expand the social base of the April Revolution, strengthen the power of the people, and improve the lives of the working people. The 19th plenum of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan posed the task of intensifying work among the masses and acquiring new friends and political allies. Only in that way will we be able to isolate, and then suppress, internal counterrevolution, close our borders to enemies, and bring about a cessation of the bloodshed and the establishment of peace in the country.

The draft of a new constitution for a Democratic Afghanistan was recently prepared. Elections to local authority bodies were completed successfully. An all-Afghan Commission of National Reconciliation is being set up within the framework of the National Fatherland Front. These important measures find support among the different strata of Afghan society. They are promoting the consolidation of revolutionary power. New tasks confront us as well in the economic field. We have drawn up and approved the first 5-year plan for the social and economic development of Afghanistan. It envisages considerable growth in industrial and agricultural production, an increase in national income, and a rise in the people's standard of living.

For the success of our revolutionary cause, a long and difficult path still has to be covered. The comprehenisve assistance and support of the Soviet Union are vitally important to democratic Afghanistan. Every Afghan patriot can feel that fraternal help in all areas of life. Recently, during a visit to Kabul, a Soviet Government delegation outlined new plans for further increasing the bilateral economic cooperation. The Soviet Union is providing Afghanistan with invaluable support in the defense of its freedom and independence, and in repelling imperialist aggression. Our people will always remember this internationalist support. We shall also remember all the Soviet servicemen who will soon be returning home. We shall see them off with honor and with words of heartfelt gratitude for fraternal help during a difficult period in our history. [end recording]

AUDITING OFFICIAL RECEIVES PDPA COUNTERPART

LD111427 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1130 GMT 11 Oct 86

[From the "Novosti" newscast; announcer-read report]

[Text] Today Comrade Kapitonov, chairman of the Central Auditing Commission of the CPSU, received Panjsheri, member of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan [PDPA] and chairman of the PDPA Auditing Commission. A friendly conversation took place, in which questions of the auditing work of the CPSU and the PDPA were discussed.

ZHOLKVER DISCUSSES U.S. PRESSURE ON MANILA

OW111311 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1115 GMT 8 Oct 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Text] The Philippines also play an important role in U.S. imperialist plans in the Asia-Pacific region. There, the largest U.S. Air Force and navy bases are located. Recently, however, the future of these bases seems under a cloud. It is not only because as all the surveys show, an overwhelming majority of the Filipinos are in favor of the bases' liquidation. Now, it could be said, the question has acquired a constitutional aspect. The country's draft Constitution, which has been worked out by a special Constitution Commission, prohibits the deployment of nuclear weapons in the Philippines. But everyone knows that nuclear weapons are carried on board U.S. Navy ships and on U.S. planes stationed at U.S. military bases. And so now the question is becoming particularly acute.

It was announced today that on 11 and 12 May of next year, parliamentary and local elections will be held in the Philippines preceded by a general plebiscite on the draft Constitution. Thus, the question of nuclear weapons on the American military bases becomes urgent, and this worries Washington a great deal. In any case, the first warning salvos have already been fired from there on Manila. Comrades, you no doubt remember the Philippine President Corazon Aquino, recently completed a trip to the American capital. She was received there with pomp and generously complemented, and was even promised aid to the tune of $200 million. However, as soon as the Constitutional Commission proposed legislative measures to turn the Philippines into a nuclear-free zone, Washington began broaching the possibility of certain sanctions against Manila. For example, Dole, the Senate Majority leader, stated that Congress may not approve aid to the Philippines. The American press considered this statement pressure applied on the Aquino government. The CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR reasons that for the destabilization of this government there is no need for a government coup; U.S. refusal to give the necessary support will be sufficient.

IZVESTIYA VIEWS MALAYSIAN SCENE, BILATERAL TIES

PM131459 [Editorial report] Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 October 1986 Morning Edition carries on page 5 a 1,200-word report by TASS correspondent N. Geronin, under the heading "Between Two Oceans," on the current state of affairs in Malaysia. Reporting first on domestic policy, he writes that "the government is making energetic efforts to guarantee housing for low-income families," while in the economic spere "main attention is being devoted to leading sectors" of the national economy and to the "necessity to develop heavy industry and reduce purchases of equipment abroad." In the foreign policy area Geronin reports:

"Soviet-Malaysian relations have been developing steadily in recent years. This applies both to political contacts and to mutually advantageous ties in the trade and economic area. In June a group of USSR Supreme Soviet deputies headed by A.U. Salimov, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, visited Malaysia as part of a trip to a number of Southeast Asian Countries. The Soviet parliamentarians had meetings with a speaker of the House of Representatives and with the foreign minister. "Opinions were exchanged on international problems, primarily in connection with efforts to preserve and strengthen peace and to elminate the nuclear threat in light of the Soviet proposals for the stage-by stage elimination of nuclear weapons. The representatives of the USSR's supreme legislative organ explained the Sovet Union's position on questions of ensuring security and developing cooperation in the Asian and Pacific region. The sides spoke in favor of reinforcing world peace, curbing the arms race, strengthening security, and expanding cooperation."

SHEVARDNADZE ARRIVAL IN BUCHAREST ANNOUNCED

LD131914 Moscow TASS in English 1813 GMT 13 Oct 86

[Text] Bucharest October 13 TASS -- Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, today arrived in the Romanian capital to attend a regular meeting of the foreign ministers' committee of the Warsaw treaty member states.

At the airport he was welcomed by Romania's Minister of Foreign Affairs Ioan Totu and other officials.

REPORTAGE ON RYZHKOV VISIT TO WARSAW

LD130833 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 13 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow October 13 TASS -- Nikolay Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, today left Moscow for Warsaw on an official friendly visit at the invitation of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party and the Government of the Polish People's Republic.

At the airport he was seen off by Aliyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Zaykov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo; Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers, ministers of the USSR, and by other officials.

Arrives In Warsaw

LD131512 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1130 GMT 13 Oct 86

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov arrived in Warsaw today. At the capital's airport he was met by Comrade Messner, member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers; Comrades Wozniak, Orzechowski, Porebski, Czyrek, members of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo, other officials and representatives of the Public of the Polish capital. Among the welcoming party were Borovikov, USSR ambassador in Poland, and Natorf, ambassador of the Polish People Republic in the USSR.

A guard of honor of Polish servicemen was drawn up at the airport. A band played the anthems of the two countries.

Also today the head of the Soviet Government laid a wreath at the tomb of the unknown soldier on Victory square in Warsaw. A wreath was laid at the Glory Obelisk at the mausoleum cemetery of Soviet servicemen who fell in the battles for the liberation of Poland. Flowers were also laid at the monument to the heroes of Warsaw.

Comments on Reykjavik

LD132128 Moscow TASS in English 2116 GMT 13 Oct 86

[Text] Warsaw October 13 TASS -- "Our visit coincided in time with an event of tremendous international importance -- the Soviet-American summit meeting in Reykjavik", Nikolay Ryzhkov, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, said at a dinner given in his honour by the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party and Government of the Polish People's Republic.

"It can be said with confidence that the work accomplished in Reykjavik was not in vain and that it has emphasised with special force that now is the time to act, time to devote all of one's energy to the cause of peace", Nikolay Ryzhkov went on.

"The Soviet Union and Poland are not only close neighbours and allies", Nikolay Ryzhkov went on. "The inviolability of our fraternal relations is due also to the fact that we are associates in the great and lofty endeavour of building a new society and asserting peace among nations. Today's exchange of views confirms again that we have full mutual understanding in the approach to questions of cooperaton and clarity in respect of the programme of joint work."

"We pay tribute to Poland's weighty contribution to the common efforts of socialist countries in the struggle for disarmament and detente, and highly appreciate its interaction with the Soviet Union and other peaceloving states in the international arena."

"Experience of history, common ideals and aims helps us to be staunch and rallied in upholding the cause of peace", Nikolay Ryzhkov went on. "No task is more pressing and urgent than that of protecting our planet and human civilisation from nuclear catastrophe".

"The realities of the nuclear-space age demand a new political thinking, renunciation of the use of force in international affairs, a persistent search for ways of politically settling outstanding issues. Proceeding from this, the Soviet Union has done much for the positive line, which acquired contours at the Soviet-American meeting in Geneva in November of last year, to be translated into concrete actions. Mention should be made first of all of the proposal by the 27th CPSU Congress to create an all-embracing system of international security, the programme of eliminating nuclear and other types of weapons of mass annihilation by the end of the present century and the package of measures set forth by Warsaw Treaty countries to reduce armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe and many other initiatives", Nikolay Ryzhkov said in conclusion.

Holds Talks With Messner

LD131834 Moscow TASS in English 1808 GMT 13 Oct 86

[Text] Warsaw October 13 TASS -- Talks were held here today between member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central committee, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR Nikolay Ryzhkov and member of the Political Bureau of Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' party, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Polish People's Republic Zbignew Messner.

The heads of government exchanged information on the course of fulfilment of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 10th PUWP congress.

They expressed satisfaction with the consistent strengthening of relations of friendship and all-round cooperation between the USSR and Poland on the Basis of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism and provisions of the treaty of friendship, cooperation and mutual assistance.

The sides stressed the big importance of the meetings and conversations between Mikhail Gorbachev and Wojciech Jaruzelski for the all-round dynamic development of Soviet-Polish relations, the further deepening of integration processes and the attainment of the set tasks in the field of economic, scientific and technical cooperation between the two countries in the period to the year 2000.

Being increasingly advanced to the fore is the utilisation of the possibilities of co-production and specialisation, new forms of cooperation in accordance with the decisions of the CMEA economic summit.

When exchanging views on key problems of the international situation the heads of government noted the special importance of the proposals made by Mikhail Gorbachev during the Soviet-American summit in Reykjavik concerning the entire set of questions of reducing nuclear arms in close linkage with a ban on spreading the arms race to outer space.

MESSNER PRAISES MOSCOW'S EFFORTS TO ENSURE PEACE

LD122021 Moscow TASS in English 2007 GMT 12 Oct 86

["Statement by Zbigniew Messner" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Warsaw October 12 TASS -- The USSR's persevering and determined effort to ensure peace in Europe and all over the world meets with universal recognition and has resolute support of the Polish people, the peoples of the countries of the socialist community, of all progressive forces of the world. A statement to this effect has been made by Zbigniew Messner, member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party, chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers, who was addressing a report and election conference of the Warsaw organisation of the Polish United Workers' Party. Today the eyes of the whole world are fixed at the capital of Iceland, the speaker stressed, mankind is impatiently looking forward to the results of the meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan. The people of goodwill are expressing hope that the Soviet Union's consistent and peaceful policy will meet with appropriate response on that side of the Atlantic. The aim of the USSR is to achieve specific results in the field of limitation of nuclear weapons, in strengthening international peace and security.

SED'S MITTAG DELEGATION MEETS ZAYKOV, TALYZIN

LD132322 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 13 Oct 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast; announcer-read report]

[Text] An SED Delegation, headed by Comrade Mittag, number of the SED Central Committee Politburo, secretary of the SED Central Committee, arrived in Moscow today for a friendly visit at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee. Later on today the SED delegation had a meeting with Comrade Zaykov, in which Comrades Talyzin, Medvedev, and other comrades took part.

POLAND'S KISZCZAK CITED ON COMBATTING OPPOSITION

PM131529 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 9 Oct 86 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Speech by C. Kiszczak"]

[Text] Warsaw, 8 Oct -- C. Kiszczak, member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo and Polish minister of internal affairs, has addressed the Konin Voivodship report and election conference. He emphasized in particular that, in the course of persistent struggle, the Polish authorities secured the normalization of the domestic political situation and ensured that the adversaries of socialism have lost their support in society and the opportunity to influence the mood of the majority of Poles.

In making the decision to release all so-called political detainees, the minister noted, the Polish authorities proceeded primarily from the premise that the 10th PZPR Congress brought to a final end the period of political destabilization of the early eighties.

At the same time C. Kiszczak pointed out that some figures from the so-called opposition immediately attempted to revive their old and defeated concepts which clearly contradict the Polish society's interests. Today their adventurist calls run contrary to the realities of the country's political life. Any threat to Poland's state system will be consistently eliminated while still at its embryonic stage.

MEDVEDEV RECEIVES MSZMP DEPARTMENT CHIEF KOTAI

LD111422 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1130 GMT 11 Oct 86

[From the "Novosti" newscast; announcer-read report]

[Text] Comrade Kotai, member of the MSZMP Central Committee and director of the Central Committee's International Relations Department, was in Moscow 9-11 October. He had talks with CPSU Central Committee departments on certain topical international questions and was received by Comrade Medvedev, CPSK Central Committee secretary.

OFFICIALS DISCUSS AGRO-INDUSTRIAL COOPERATION

PM130859 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Oct 86 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Conversation Held"]

[Text] V.S. Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee, received J. Marjai, deputy chairman of the Hungarian Council of Ministers, 9 October.

During the meeting, which took place in a warm comradely atmosphere, they discussed several questions of cooperation in the agro-industrial complex area.

ARGENTINE PRESIDENT ALFONSIN ARRIVES IN MOSCOW

Gromyko Receives Alfonsin

LD131315 Moscow TASS in English 1309 GMT 13 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow October 13 TASS -- President of the Republic of Argentina Raul Ricardo Alfonsin arrived for an official visit in Moscow today at the invitation of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and the Government of the USSR.

He was met at the airport by member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Andrey Gromyko, [and] other officials.

Gromyko Speaks at Dinner

LD131857 Moscow TASS in English 1848 GMT 13 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow October 13 TASS -- Satisfaction with the development of relations between the Soviet Union and Argentina was expressed by Andrey Gromyko, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. Speaking at a Kremlin Dinner in honour of the President of Argentina Raul Alfonsin, he said that relations between the two countries are an example of equal and friendly ties.

"The spirit of mutual trust the marks the Soviet-Argentine political dialogue", Andrey Gromyko said, "creates a businesslike atmosphere when questions of bilateral relations are studied and solved and is a contribution to the improvement of the international atmosphere".

"The Soviet Union is doing all it can to create an atmosphere of trust and cooperation between states of all regions of the world, all continents", Andrey Gromyko stressed. "The USSR demonstrated its policy of peace, disarmament and averting nuclear war at the just ended meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan in Reykjavik".

"At his press conference yesterday Mikhail Gorbachev made a principled and in-depth appraisal of the results of that meeting", Andrey Gromyko said. He stressed that "both great powers - the USSR and the USA - when discussing and solving acute and pressing international problems should further proceed from the tremendous responsibility that lies on them for the state of affairs in the world, for averting nuclear war".

Andrey Gromyko expressed serious concern with the existence of seats of tension in various parts of the world, one of which is in Central America. The Soviet Union, he said, emphatically condemns the policy of state terrorism which is being pursued in front of the whole world by imperialist circles in respect of Nicaragua. It is well known that an Arab country, Libya, also fell victim to this policy recently.

The head of the Soviet state declared support for the constructive efforts of the Contadora Group and the Support Group of which Argentina is a participant.

Touching on the important decisions on questions of war and peace adopted recently in Harare, Andrey Gromyko noted that the USSR shared a common approach with the Nonaligned Movement to such vital problems of our epoch as ending nuclear tests, preventing an arms race in outer space and averting nuclear war.

In conclusion Ardrey Gromyko expressed confidence that the Argentine president's visit to the Soviet Union will give a new impulse to the development of multifaceted cooperation between the two countries and contribute to the further strengthening of trust between states.

Alfonsin Replies

LD132106 Moscow TASS in English 2026 GMT 13 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow October 13 TASS -- President Raul Alfonsin of the Argentine Republic has described his visit to the USSR as the climax in the century-old history of the diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and Argentina. He was addressing today a dinner given in his honour in the Kremlin on behalf of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Soviet Government.

The USSR and Argentina have succeeded in building a friendship bridge, Raul Alfonsin said. The current year has been marked by new events, which contribute to a strengthening of ties between the two countries. Along with the agreement on cooperation in the field of fisheries signed recently, a whole number of agreements in various fields has been reached, including in the economic, cultural, scientific fields and that of air transport. They have enriched the contents of the traditional relations of mutual respect and benefit between the two countries. The visits to the USSR of the foreign minister and the president of Argentina, Raoul Alfonsin said, are proof of the will of the Argentine Government to give a fresh impetus to the development of relations with the Soviet Union.

Touching upon international issues, the president of Argentina stressed that the highest value of the international community is the right to life. Any threat concerns everybody equally, and therefore it is the paramount duty of states to ensure full exercise of that right which is today infringed upon by extremism, the arms race, discrimination in all of its forms, and the development problems. Raul Alfonsin expressed conviction that reaching agreement between the Soviet Union and the USA on putting an end to nuclear testing and preventing the spreading of the arms race into outer space can become a turning point on the way towards building a world protected from the danger of a nuclear conflict.

Touching upon the problem of settling the Argentine-British dispute over sovereignty of the Malvinas and other archipelagos in the southern Atlantic, Raul Alfonsin said that Argentine had convincingly demonstrated its will to settle that conflict peacefully, through a dialogue and talks.

Touching upon the situatioin, which emerged in Central America, the president expressed conviction that the efforts of the Contadora [Group] and of its support group aimed at a settlement of the conflict would be a success only if all the countries involved in the conflict and the states having interest in that region display true political will for a peaceful settlement.

The president went on to say that the existing international economic order reduces to a nought the hard work done by the peoples of the developing countries, by forcing on them artificial restrictions in international trade. For the international economic system to develop steadily and without conflict it should work for the benefit of all and not only for the benefit of some of its participants.

Talks Begin

LD140633 Moscow TASS in English 0629 GMT 14 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow October 14 TASS -- Soviet-Argentine talks opened in the Kremlin today. They are being conducted by Andrey Gromyko, a member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, and President Raul Ricardo Alfonsin of the Republic of Argentina.

Raul Ricardo Alfonsin arrived in Moscow yesterday on an official visit at the invitation of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Soviet Government.

'ANTISUBMARINE SHIPS' TO VISIT HAVANA 20-24 Oct

LD112213 Moscow TASS in English 2148 GMT 11 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow October 12 TASS -- It has been agreed that a Soviet naval squadron consisting of the big anti-submarine ships "Ochakov" and "Krasniy Kavkaz", a diesel powered submarine and a tanker under the command of Vice Admiral Fedor Starozhilov will pay an official friendly visit to port Havana in the Republic of Cuba from October 20 to 24.

ARISTOV, MEXICAN COMMERCE SECRETARY HOLD TALKS

LD132007 Moscow TASS in English 1716 GMT 13 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow October 13 TASS -- Various aspects of economic ties between the USSR and Mexico, the state and prospects of bilateral trade, exchange of information about the national trade policy are some of the subjects, whose discussion has been started by the delegations of the two countries at the Fourth Meeting of the Mixed Soviet-Mexican Commission for Trade and Economic Cooperation which opened in Moscow.

The Soviet delegation is led by Boris Aristov, USSR foreign trade minister, the Mexican delegation -- by Hector Hernandez Cervantes, Mexico's secretary of commerce and industrial development.

At the meeting of the commission, which is to end on October 15, the officials -- members of the delegations and representatives of business world -- will exchange views on the problems of economic cooperation between the two countries as a whole and by specific sectors of the economy. The spectrum of the sectors, cooperation in which will be discussed, is sufficiently broad. It includes the power industry and ferrous metallurgy, construction and agriculture, fisheries and cooperation between banks.